

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

THURSDAY, November 19, 1903.

The House met at 12 o'clock m.

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. HENRY N. COUDEN, D. D.

The Journal of yesterday's proceedings was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. PARKINSON, its reading clerk, announced that the Senate had passed the following resolutions; in which the concurrence of the House was requested:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring). That the Secretary of War cause an examination and survey to be made for the purpose of ascertaining the cost and feasibility of extending a 16-foot channel of suitable width from the present channel north of Corner Stake light in an easterly direction and north of Shooters Island to Kill van Kull, to straighten and increase the width of waterway at Shooters Island and relieve the congestion of commerce at that point; also, a like examination and survey for the purpose of ascertaining the cost and feasibility of removing the reef at Bergen Point light and deepening to 16 feet and improving and straightening the channel between Kill van Kull and Elizabethport, with a plan or plans for making such improvements and estimates thereof.

Senate concurrent resolution No. 16.

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring). That the Secretary of War be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to cause a survey to be made of Portland Harbor, Maine, to include Fore River above Portland Bridge, and the entrance to Back Cove, with a view to widening and deepening the channels at those localities, and to submit plans and estimates for such improvements.

Senate concurrent resolution No. 17.

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring). That the Secretary of War be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to cause a survey to be made and estimates to be submitted of the cost of dredging and otherwise improving the harbor of Cold Spring Inlet, Cape May County, N. J., so as to meet the demands of commerce.

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTIONS REFERRED.

Under clause 2, Rule XXIV, the following resolutions were taken from the Speaker's table and referred to their appropriate committees as indicated below:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring). That the Secretary of War cause an examination and survey to be made for the purpose of ascertaining the cost and feasibility of extending a 16-foot channel of suitable width from the present channel north of Corner Stake light in an easterly direction and north of Shooters Island to Kill van Kull, to straighten and increase the width of waterway at Shooters Island and relieve the congestion of commerce at that point; also, a like examination and survey for the purpose of ascertaining the cost and feasibility of removing the reef at Bergen Point light and deepening to 16 feet and improving and straightening the channel between Kill van Kull and Elizabethport, with a plan or plans for making such improvements and estimates thereof—

to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Senate concurrent resolution No. 16:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring). That the Secretary of War be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to cause a survey to be made of Portland Harbor, Maine, to include Fore River above Portland Bridge, and the entrance to Back Cove, with a view to widening and deepening the channels at those localities, and to submit plans and estimates for such improvements—

to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Senate concurrent resolution No. 17:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring). That the Secretary of War be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to cause a survey to be made and estimates to be submitted of the cost of dredging and otherwise improving the harbor of Cold Spring Inlet, Cape May County, N. J., so as to meet the demands of commerce—

to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

CUBAN RECIPROCITY.

The SPEAKER. In accordance to the resolution adopted heretofore, the House resolves itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 1921, and the gentleman from New York, Mr. SHERMAN, will take the chair.

The House accordingly resolved itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, with Mr. SHERMAN in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The House is in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 1921, the title of which will be announced by the Clerk.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 1921) to carry into effect a convention between the United States and the Republic of Cuba, signed on the 11th day of December, 1902.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BROUSSARD].

Mr. BROUSSARD. Mr. Chairman, it would seem an undue waste of the time of the House for me to address it at this moment, when it is well known that every Member on this floor has already made up his mind as to how his vote shall be cast on the pending bill.

I can not, however, sit silently by while a rank and ruthless injustice is about to be perpetrated on the State of Louisiana. The pending measure when it becomes law will impose a tax upon the people of the State of Louisiana in excess of \$2,000,000 an-

nually. That State produces about 300,000 tons of sugar annually, and it is proposed by this measure to reduce the tariff upon sugar coming into the United States from Cuba by 20 per cent of the prevailing rate of duties. Inasmuch as I am instructed by the Democratic constituency that has sent me here to cast my vote against this proposition, and inasmuch as the Democrats who have elected me to this House believe that the reduction of this tariff upon Cuban sugar will not accrue to the benefit of the people of the United States nor to the people of Cuba, but will accrue exclusively to the benefit of the sugar manufacturers of this country, and inasmuch as they believe, and I believe, that this bill is not along the lines of Democratic reform, I can neither permit unchallenged the expression to go forth from Members on this side of the House that this is a Democratic measure nor that this law will inure to the benefit of the sugar consumers of this country or to the Cuban sugar producers.

That it is not a Democratic measure must be taken to be correct, if the history of this legislation is looked into. We know that it is essentially an Administration measure. We know that in the general recommendation made by the President to the last Congress this measure was highly recommended. We know that when there was delay by the last Congress about our taking up the matter that a special message was sent to Congress by the President urging immediate action on the proposition, and we know that Congress is now in session, sitting in extraordinary session on a call issued by the President, in order to carry into law this proposition.

But, perhaps, this is not sufficient reason to characterize this bill as a Republican measure. After careful examination of the platforms of both the great parties, I find two expressions of Republican approval of this proposition and but one expression on this subject in any Democratic platform.

The Republican platform of 1892 contains the following:

We point to the success of the Republican policy of reciprocity, under which our export trade has vastly increased and new and enlarged markets have been opened for the products of our farms and workshops. We remind the people of the bitter opposition of the Democratic party to this practical business measure, and claim that, executed by a Republican Administration, our present laws will eventually give us control of the trade of the world.

In the Republican platform of 1896 the following declaration is to be found:

We believe the repeal of the reciprocity arrangements negotiated by the last Republican Administration was a national calamity, and we demand their renewal and extension on such terms as will equalize our trade with other nations, remove the restrictions which now obstruct the sale of American products in the ports of other countries, and secure enlarged markets for the products of our farms, forests, and factories.

Protection and reciprocity are twin measures of Republican policy and go hand in hand. Democratic rule has recklessly struck down both, and both must be reestablished. Protection for what we produce; free admission for the necessities of life which we do not produce; reciprocity agreements of mutual interests which again open markets for us in return for our open markets to others. Protection builds up domestic industry and trade and secures our own market for ourselves. Reciprocity builds up foreign trade and finds an outlet for our surplus.

Going over to the Democratic platform of 1892, promulgated at Chicago that year, I find the only expression on reciprocity ever promulgated by the party. I shall read that plank of the platform bearing on this subject, because I take it that Democrats prefer to draw their interpretations of Democratic doctrines from the platform of their party rather than from the statements of gentlemen, no matter how high in authority they may be in the party. Section 4 of the platform of 1892 reads as follows:

Trade interchange on the basis of reciprocal advantages to the countries participating is a time-honored doctrine of the Democratic faith; but we denounce the sham reciprocity which juggles with the people's desire for enlarged foreign markets and freer exchanges by pretending to establish closer trade relations for a country whose articles of export are almost exclusively agricultural products with other countries that are also agricultural, while erecting a custom-house barrier of prohibitive tariff taxes against the richest and the countries of the world that stand ready to take our entire surplus of products and to exchange therefor commodities which are necessities and comforts of life among our own people.

It will be noticed that this declaration of Democratic doctrine not only characterizes the reciprocity of the Republican party as sham reciprocity, but defines what sham reciprocity is—as that kind of reciprocity establishing "closer trade relations for a country whose articles of export are almost exclusively agricultural products with other countries that are also agricultural." Now, it is evident that this treaty falls directly within the scope of that definition, for of the \$32,000,000 worth of the product of Cuba coming into the United States last year, more than \$31,000,000 were raw material and agricultural products.

In the campaign of that year the campaign book issued by the national Democratic campaign committee characterized this species of reciprocity, which had been approved by the Republican platform, as shown above, and condemned by our platform, as follows:

That the system of reciprocity to which the Republicans are now pointing with pride was begotten two years ago in fraud, was conceived in dissimulation, was born in falsehood, and is now wrapped in the juggled figures of systematic misrepresentation.

I am indebted for this excerpt to the courtesy of my friend from Georgia [Mr. BARTLETT], who quoted it from the campaign book of 1892 in the great speech delivered by him against Cuban reciprocity April 16, 1902.

It was upon this issue in 1892, and since, that the people of the South, believing in tariff reform, condemned reciprocity in many State and Congressional platforms, from one of which my friend from Texas [Mr. BURGESS] read yesterday as juggling with a principle to which the Democratic party could not subscribe. I find that my friend from Missouri [Mr. CLARK] the other day paid high encomium to a former leader of the minority on the floor of this House, Mr. BAILEY of Texas. I would like to commend to him a passage in the speech of this great leader of the Democratic party while speaking on the Dingley bill. He said in part:

The Chicago platform does not differ from the former declarations of the Democratic party as to the right of the Government to lay taxes. It does, however, differ essentially from the platform of 1892 as to the policy of exempting raw materials from taxation. But, sir, the doctrine of free raw materials was itself a radical departure from all Democratic traditions, and in departing from it the Chicago convention simply returned to the time-honored principles of our party. Never in all its history, until it fell under that strange delusion which can only be described as Clevelandism, did the Democratic party countenance a proposition to allow the manufacturers of this country to buy almost everything they need free from taxation, while giving them the benefit of a duty on nearly everything they sell. [Applause.] The first attempt to commit the Democratic party to this pernicious heresy was made by Hon. A. S. Hewitt, during the debate on the bill to create a tariff commission, in 1882. Mr. Hewitt was then a Democratic Member of this House; but he admits that all the Democratic leaders of that time were opposed to his position.

I point to this part of Mr. BAILEY's speech to show to the gentleman and to show to the Democratic Members of this House that not only was the platform opposed to reciprocity, the very reciprocity which we are discussing now; not only did the campaign book give it out to Democrats as sound Democratic doctrine that such a policy could not be pursued by the Democratic party, but Mr. BAILEY, then the leader of the minority in the House, took the position that free raw material was a pernicious heresy of the Democratic party and had never been heard of except in the convention of 1892. If, therefore, free raw material is a heresy of the Democratic party, under what justification can a Democrat cast his vote to reduce the tariff on raw material without in any wise reducing the tariff on manufactured articles? How can a Democrat, viewing this bill as a reduction of the tariff on raw material, go back upon the declaration of his party on this subject? How can he go back on the statements made by the representatives of the party in the campaign book of that year and on the floor of this House?

But gentlemen quote Mr. Jefferson as favoring reciprocity. Now, some one has said that no opinion is stronger than the reasons upon which it rests. If Mr. Jefferson at any time advocated reciprocity, the later doctrine of the Democratic party has condemned it, and what difficulty would confront gentlemen on this side of the House who, believing that a tariff for revenue is a correct Democratic doctrine, espoused the cause of reciprocity? What would such a position lead to? Where would be the difference on the tariff between that position and the position occupied by gentlemen on the other side who believe in a protective tariff and reciprocity? There would then be but this difference between the position of the two parties on the tariff: The Republicans would start by building a high tariff, thus bringing about a surplus in the Treasury, and would then reform the tariff by enacting reciprocal trade relations with other countries, destroying this surplus until the amount actually collected through the custom-houses, plus the internal taxes of the country, would bring the tariff to one sufficiently large to raise the revenues necessary to administer the affairs of the Government.

The Democratic party, believing in a tariff for revenue, would enact a tariff law the collections from which, added to the internal taxes of the country, would meet the expenditures of the Government economically administered, and then, in order to carry out this doctrine of reciprocity, just to the extent that reciprocal trade relations were established between this Government and a foreign country the rate of tariff on goods coming from other countries would have to be raised by so much as the treaty of reciprocity with the country establishing such trade relations with this country would be reduced, and with each subsequent reciprocity treaty a like course would have to be pursued until the rate on goods coming from countries not in reciprocal trade relations with this Government reached the same total as those ultimately fixed by the Republican party in pursuing its policy, so that eventually there will be no difference between the position of the Democratic party and the Republican party on the question of tariff except as to the method adopted to ultimately reach the same point.

One party would start by building high rates and reducing them by reciprocity treaties; the other would start by building rates just sufficient to administer the Government and then raising

them as treaties were consummated between this country and other countries. To make more clear this position let us assume that the Democratic instead of the Republican party had been in power in 1897, and that a bill in place of the Dingley bill had been fashioned by the Democratic party, the establishment of the proposed trade relation between this Government and the island of Cuba would necessarily reduce the revenue and create a deficit in the Treasury. But as no one on this side of the House advocates the administering of the affairs of the Government on a credit basis, it would immediately become the duty of this Congress, after ratifying this treaty between Cuba and the United States, to correspondingly raise the rates on all articles imported into this country from other countries than Cuba, so as to raise additional revenues, and in doing that raise the tariff in the exact proportion with the reduction of revenues brought about by the reciprocity treaty with Cuba.

As between the two positions, tariff for revenue and reciprocity on the one side and protection and reciprocity on the other side, the Republican idea would at least have the virtue of stability, the other would be an ever-shifting process, dangerous to trade and to continued party success. The other proposition which I desire to discuss is: Who will derive the benefit of this 20 per cent reduction? The matter is so plain to my mind that the trust will get the benefit of this reduction that I can not conceive by what method of argument gentlemen can present any other view. In the first place, in the last Congress when this bill passed this House, taking off the differential on sugar, that differential by which the sugar trust subsists, the bill went to the Senate, and there it remained in committee and did not come out of the committee at all during that session. What was the power that held it in that committee? Was it the Cuban planter, who was at that time said to be suffering in Cuba? No; for the Cuban planters did not produce one single pound of refined sugar. Not only do they produce no refined sugar for export from their country, but they actually import refined sugar from the United States to Cuba for their consumption. They could not and did not complain because the differential was stricken off.

Was it the beet-sugar producer who complained? No; because all of the representatives of States growing beet sugar on this floor voted to take off the differential. Was it the Louisiana cane-sugar growers who protested against it? Not they; for their representatives voted to take off the differential. Where was the power that held this bill in the Senate committee? Everyone familiar with the subject knows that the trust held up the bill.

Did the President, finding the differential had been taken off in the House, and advocating reciprocity because, as he contended, of the poverty of the Cuban planter, aware of the fact that Cuba produced no refined sugar, and that the taking off of the differential could in no wise affect the production of Cuban sugars brought in this country, send a message to the Senate, as he had done in the House, urging the immediate passage of the bill? He did not. The taking off of the differential was the destruction of the sugar trust. The passage of the Cuban reciprocity bill with the retention of the differential was in the interest of the sugar trust. So that the old lines drawn by the President to give this additional bonus to the trust had to be abandoned, for the trust would not permit a reduction of the tariff rates on sugar if at the same time the differential was taken off of the sugars of the world. That course, therefore, had to be abandoned. Meanwhile the Senate, through a committee, commenced an investigation of this matter to ascertain what connection, if any, the sugar trust had with the move for the reduction of the tariff on Cuban sugars.

It is due to the splendid work of Senator TELLER that a direct connection was established between the sugar trust and the movement to reduce the tariff on Cuban sugars. It was through the efforts of Senator TELLER that it was ascertained that literature sent out in the interest of this movement had been paid for by the trust. And while Mr. Havemeyer, president of the American Sugar Refining Company, had declared before that committee his indifference to the passage of this measure, yet Mr. Thurber, president of the United States Export Association, was forced by Senator TELLER to the admission that the sugar trust had contributed at least \$2,500 toward conducting the campaign in behalf of the reduction of the tariff on Cuban sugars. A friend of mine, referring to this matter, called this measure a reciprocity treaty between Havemeyer, of the American Sugar Refining Company, and Thurber, of the United States Export Association. And I believe that characterization of the proposition to be correct.

Immediately, however, upon the differential being taken off in the House, the President of the United States, in usurpation of powers which belonged to this House, entered into a treaty of reciprocity with the Government of Cuba, a treaty by which he contemplated to bring about the same result that had been sought to be brought about in this House, reducing the tariff on Cuban sugars and maintaining the differential, and then he convened Congress in extra session in order to adopt this proposition.

Now, will not the sugar trust get the entire benefit from this, and will the sugar planters of Cuba derive a single cent of profit out of this proposition? I contend that the sugar trust will get the entire benefit and that the Cuban planters will not get a cent of it, and I will explain the reason why I think so, and I will produce the facts upon which I make this statement.

We in Louisiana are compelled, just as the Cuban planter is compelled, to sell all of our product to the sugar trust. The American Sugar Refining Company has a refinery in New Orleans. We sell our sugar to the American Sugar Refining Company. When we come to New Orleans to our market we are met with this condition of affairs. The trust says to us: "The price of sugar in New York is, say, 3½ cents. We will give you for your sugar, on the New Orleans market, 3½ cents, less three-sixteenths of a cent a pound." When we ask them why they deduct three-sixteenths of a cent a pound from the New York price they say the freight to New York is three-sixteenths of a cent a pound. When we tell them that our sugars do not go out of Louisiana; that they have their refinery right at hand; that they refine their sugar at that point, and that New Orleans is a distributing point, and that therefore they do not have to pay any freight charges to New York on our raw sugar, they say they know that as well as we do, but they say to us: "If you do not care to sell your sugars to us in the city of New Orleans, then move it to New York, pay the freight rate, and there you will get the New York price on your sugar." There being nothing to gain by this but delay, we sell in New Orleans, and thus they deprive us of the three-sixteenths of a cent a pound on every pound of sugar produced in Louisiana.

Being the sole purchasers of this raw product, if they have the power thus to mulct us in three-sixteenths of a cent a pound because the freight rate to New York is three-sixteenths of a cent a pound, then if you reduce your tariff 20 per cent on Cuban sugar, and they exert the same influence and the same power and tell the Cuban planter that they will pay them the price of their raw sugar, which is the cost of producing it, with a small margin of profit, plus the tariff upon the sugar entering New York, less the 20 per cent reduction which has been made in the tariff, or they can go elsewhere with their sugar, what can the Cuban sugar producers do? Where can they go? Where is there any other market for them? Will they not, like the Louisiana planter, be compelled to turn their sugar over to the American Sugar Refining Company, the American Sugar Refining Company taking possession of the 20 per cent reduction and placing it in their treasury, thus transferring the money, which now goes into the Treasury of the United States from the present tariff on Cuban sugar, into the treasury of the American Sugar Refining Company? Is there any answer to that proposition?

The other day I asked the gentleman from New York [Mr. McCLELLAN] a question which he said he would not answer just at that time, but that he would answer later on. I do not know whether or not the gentleman from New York is now on the floor. I have read his speech carefully and I find in it no answer to the question which I put to him. The question which I asked him was this:

Will the gentleman explain to the House how it is that three days ago prime yellow clarified (unrefined) sugar was quoted at 3½, while last year on the same day it was 3¼, or a difference of ¼ points against the American producer, while refined sugar on the same day last year was quoted at 4.21 and this year at 4.50? In other words, why is it that refined sugar has gained 23 points since Congress has met, and prime yellow clarified, the best grade of unrefined sugar, has lost ¾ points, a difference of just 32½ points, the exact amount fixed by the pending reciprocity bill?

In order to explain fully the purport of this question and the facts which I sought to elicit from the gentleman from New York, I had better make an explanation of the differential. The present tariff rate on sugar imported into this country is a sliding-scale rate so far as raw sugar is concerned. The rate is for sugars testing 75° of the polariscope, 0.95 of a cent per pound, and for each additional degree of the polariscope 0.035 of a cent per pound. Now, under that scale sugars testing 100 would pay 1.82½, or \$1.82½ per 100 pounds, while refined sugar pays 1.95, or \$1.95 per 100 pounds. So that, theoretically speaking, the differential is only 12½ points, or 12½ cents per 100 pounds. But all sugar above 96 test is classed as refined sugar, and 96 test sugar pays a rate of duty amounting to 1.61, or \$1.61 per 100 pounds. So that immediately after passing the 96 test sugars pay 1.95, or \$1.95 per 100 pounds. Therefore the real differential is not 12½ points, but 34 points; and that is the differential legislated primarily for the interest of the sugar trust, though in some degree it enhances the value of American produced sugar.

It would necessarily follow, if, as contended by the gentleman from New York [Mr. McCLELLAN], there is only one market at the same time in this country for all kinds of sugar, the difference between the price on raw sugar and refined sugar should at no time be more than 34 points, or 34 cents per 100 pounds, and the price of each should travel in parallel lines. But, as a matter of fact, such is not the case. Taking the question propounded

to him, we find that last year, on the 15th of November, prime yellow clarified sold for 3¼. This year, on the same day, it sold for 3½, or a difference of practically ¼ points. But on the same day last year refined sugar sold for 4.21, and on that day this year for 4.50, a difference of 29 points. So that the producer on the 15th of November was practically ¾ points behind last year's market on the same day, because it was known that Cuban reciprocity would not be successful in the Congress, while the consumer was being charged 29 points more for refined sugar. And adding the loss to the producer, ¾, to the loss to the consumer, 29 points, we find a difference of 32½ points clear gain to the trust on the market value of the difference between raw and refined sugars.

Now, all sugars coming from Cuba last year were of an average test of 94. But 94 sugars pay 1.61, and assuming the present crop of Cuba to test 94, which is more than probable, 20 per cent reduction on the tariff on that test, or 24 per cent reduction on 1.61, equals 32½ points. So that on the 15th of November the trust, with the full knowledge that this measure would become law, and knowing that the Louisiana sugar producer was on the market with his crop, deducted the 32½ points in anticipation of the passage of this bill. And between the Louisiana producer and the American consumer the American Sugar Trust is now appropriating the 32½ points contemplated by this bill. If they charge this against us to-day, will they not charge it against the Cuban crop when it commences to reach the ports of the United States next month?

But since November 15, when the question was asked the gentleman from New York [Mr. McCLELLAN], on this morning the secretary of the New Orleans Sugar Exchange, now in Washington, is in receipt of a telegram, which I hold in my hand, signed by the president of that exchange, which reads as follows:

3½ average price prime yellows to-day. Refiners here buying basis 3½ for 96 test.

Gentlemen will note prime yellow is quoted at 3½, but that the refiners are buying 96 test at 3½, evidencing what I have just recited, the forced reduction of the price of our sugar, because we disposed of it on the New Orleans instead of the New York market. But this telegram conveys more than that. Since November 15 our sugars have dropped from 3½ to 3½ (which is equivalent to 3½); 3½ from 3½ shows a drop of ¼, or a difference of plus 24 points. So that, not content with taking 29 points from the American consumer at this time, we are losing by the simple agitation of this question here, on the Louisiana crop, 24 points over last year's price.

In the face of these demonstrations can any gentleman further argue that the trust will not get the 20 per cent reduction contemplated by this bill? These bandits of modern American commerce preying upon the American people by devices of stealth of action and tricks of cunning are as affectual in accomplishing their purpose as their prototypes of more ancient times accomplished theirs by personal exposure, physical risk, and misdirected courage.

Shall it be said that this Congress, realizing the full effect of this measure—shall it be said that the Democratic Members of this Congress, realizing as they did in the last Congress that this gigantic monster is prepared to swallow up the substance of the people, will deliberately cast their vote to again enlarge the field of the differential? For I contend that, in view of these demonstrations, the proof of which I have just furnished the House, the 20 per cent reduction on Cuban sugars means an additional differential in favor of the trust.

The Democratic party, opposed to trusts, should never align itself to a proposition intending to give larger scope, greater opportunity, and more powerful leverage to extort from the people of this country additional tribute to this awful concern.

That the effort will be made on the part of the Democrats before we take a vote on this bill to take off the differential is well known to this country; that this effort will be unavailing is well known to the Democrats on this floor. Failing in that, failing in the effort to relieve the people from the unjust taxation imposed upon them by the sugar trust, realizing that the effect of this legislation will be to add a further differential in favor of the trust, almost equivalent to the differential which it now unduly receives, will any Democrat lend his efforts, cast his vote, or use his influence to bring about the perpetration of this outrage upon the sugar industry of this country, knowing full well that no citizen will be benefited by that action, that no Cuban planter will derive any part of the profits of this reduction, but that in its entirety, as though lifting bodily that amount of money from the Treasury of the United States and transferring it into the coffers of this corporation, the trust will receive every cent of it? If that be not true, then why has not the last bill with the differential off become law? If that be not true, then why was the American Sugar Refinery lending its efforts and influence toward carrying through Congress this legislation? Why has it had its lobbyists

in the corridors of this building, and why is it engaged at this moment in taxing the Louisiana sugar planter even in advance of the passage of this measure?

We in Louisiana have always contended from the inception of this matter that the trust will get the benefit of this reduction. Gentlemen on this floor have contended otherwise. There certainly is a way by which this matter can be adjusted to the satisfaction of all parties concerned. We are willing to stand the test of our contention. Why not make a provision in this bill that if at any time it should be proven that the trust does receive the benefit of this reduction, then it shall be the duty of the President to abrogate this treaty with Cuba? Clearly, if the Cuban people do not get the benefit of the reduction they will be interested in proving that fact. Clearly, if the sugar trust extorts from them this 20 per cent, which they believe they will receive, they will not hesitate to make the fact public. Clearly, if the Louisiana planter sees the price of his commodity reduced because of this legislation, and the trust receives the profits accruing from it, he will not be interested in concealing the facts, and the facts which I have given above would soon be substantiated, so that the President of the United States would be compelled to give recognition of the fact that this legislation inured exclusively to the benefit of the sugar trust; and I do not believe that, should such a condition arise, the President of the United States would either neglect or delay to carry out the behest of Congress if presented to him in the manner which I have described.

No harm can grow out of such a proposition. Or, if the trust does not get the profits, then the provision in the bill would be harmless. But if, on the other hand, the trust should get the benefit of it, I take it that no man on this floor—certainly no Democrat on this floor—would want to see a continuation of conditions whereby at least one of the trusts of this country was a direct beneficiary of legislation in the framing of which they had participated. Is not this a fair proposition? Can any one urge a reason against the adoption of such a proposition? Oh, I know that my Democratic friends will say that the rules under which this bill is being considered precludes the possibility of an amendment, but if they can find a way to submit a proposition to take off the differential, why can they not couple with that proposition the one which I now submit? True there would be as little opportunity of securing the passage of this amendment as there is of passing the one taking off the differential, but it would have served as a warning on the country that in the participation of Members on this side of the Chamber in this legislation they are at least free from any desire, which I know is true, to legislate any additional favors upon an institution now overburdened with favors growing out of past legislation.

Such a proposition as I have indicated is thoroughly within the power of the House to include in this proposition. Such a course of action on the part of Congress has at least two precedents to go by. The countervailing duty fixed in the Dingley law is along the lines of this suggestion, and the suspension of articles placed on the free list by the McKinley law and the imposition by proclamation of a stated duty on such articles, which included sugar, hides, etc., was a provision in the McKinley bill. In the case of Field v. Clark (143 U. S. Reports, p. 649) the Supreme Court held that that species of legislation was perfectly constitutional. After going over innumerable authorities, Judge Harlan, as the organ of the court, concludes as follows:

That Congress can not delegate legislative power to the President is a principle universally recognized as vital to the integrity and maintenance of the system of government ordained by the Constitution. The act of October 1, 1890, in the particular under consideration, is not inconsistent with that principle. It does not, in any real sense, invest the President with the power of legislation. For the purpose of securing reciprocal trade with countries producing and exporting sugar, molasses, coffee, tea, and hides, Congress itself determined that the provisions of the act of October 1, 1890, permitting the free introduction of such articles, should be suspended as to any country producing and exporting them that imposed exactions and duties on the agricultural and other products of the United States, which the President deemed, that is, which he found to be, reciprocally unequal and unreasonable. Congress itself prescribed, in advance, the duties to be levied, collected, and paid on sugar, molasses, coffee, tea, or hides, produced by or exported from such designated country, while the suspension lasted. Nothing involving the expediency or the just operation of such legislation was left to the determination of the President. The words, "he may deem," in the third section, of course, implied that the President would examine the commercial regulations of other countries producing and exporting sugar, molasses, coffee, tea, and hides, and form a judgment as to whether they were reciprocally equal and reasonable, or the contrary, in their effect upon American products. But when he ascertained the fact that duties and exactions, reciprocally unequal and unreasonable, were imposed upon the agricultural or other products of the United States by a country producing and exporting sugar, molasses, coffee, tea, or hides, it became his duty to issue a proclamation declaring the suspension, as to that country, which Congress had determined should occur. He had no discretion in the premises except in respect to the duration of the suspension so ordered. But that related only to the enforcement of the policy established by Congress.

As the suspension was absolutely required when the President ascertained the existence of a particular fact, it can not be said that in ascertaining that fact and in issuing his proclamation in obedience to the legislative will he exercised the function of making laws. Legislative power was exercised when Congress declared that the suspension should take effect upon a named contingency. What the President was required to do was simply in execu-

tion of the act of Congress. It was not the making of law. He was the mere agent of the lawmaking department to ascertain and declare the event upon which its expressed will was to take effect. It was a part of the law itself as it left the hands of Congress that the provisions, full and complete in themselves, permitting the free introduction of sugars, molasses, coffee, tea, and hides from particular countries should be suspended in a given contingency, and that in case of such suspensions certain duties should be imposed.

"The true distinction," as Judge Ranney, speaking for the supreme court of Ohio, has well said, "is between the delegation of power to make the law, which necessarily involves a discretion as to what it shall be, and conferring authority or discretion as to its execution, to be exercised under and in pursuance of the law. The first can not be done; to the latter no valid objection can be made." (Cincinnati, Wilmington, etc., Railroad v. Commissioners, 1 Ohio Stat., 88.)

In *Moore v. City of Reading* (21 Pa. Stat., 188, 202) the language of the court was:

"Half the statutes on our books are in the alternative, depending upon the discretion of some person or persons to whom is confided the duty of determining whether the proper occasion exists for executing them. But it can not be said that the exercise of such discretion is the making of the law."

So in *Locke's Appeal* (72 Pa. Stat., 491, 498):

"To assert that a law is less than a law because it is made to depend on a future event or act is to rob the legislature of the power to act wisely for the public welfare whenever a law is passed relating to a state of affairs not yet developed or to things future or impossible to fully know."

The proper distinction, the court said, was this:

"The legislature can not delegate its power to make a law, but it can make a law to delegate a power to determine some fact or state of things upon which the law makes or intends to make its own action depend. To deny this would be to stop the wheels of government. There are many things upon which wise and useful legislation must depend which can not be known to the lawmaking power, and must, therefore, be a subject of inquiry and determination outside of the halls of legislation."

What has been said is equally applicable to the objection that the third section of the act invests the President with treaty-making power.

The court is of opinion that the third section of the act of October 1, 1890, is not liable to the objection that it transfers legislative and treaty-making power to the President. Even if it were, it would not by any means follow that other parts of the act, those which directly imposed duties upon articles imported, would be inoperative. But we need not in this connection enter upon the consideration of that question.

The President of the United States in negotiating this treaty usurped a prerogative of this body, violated a constitutional provision placing exclusively in the power of this body bills affecting the revenue of the Government; and it will not do for gentlemen to contend that this is not so, because in the bill itself appears a provision declaring that this action on our part shall not be construed as a surrender of the right of this body to originate bills affecting the revenue.

How harlequinlike this position! This House, realizing that it is being despoiled of one of its constitutional privileges, submits it—nay, assists in the despoiling, and contents itself with a mild protest that this submission, that this assistance shall not be construed as a submission and an assistance. What absurd folly! Is this House, under the Republican policy of centralization of power into one hand, ready to abdicate its most sacred rights? Is this House ready to subscribe with a mild form of protest to being thus despoiled of this power? Is this House prepared to abrogate in the future its power to legislate and regulate tariff schedules, revenue-producing laws, everything affecting the revenue, to the President of the United States and submit to it, agree to play the second fiddle in the exercise of a power exclusively intrusted to it by the Constitution of the United States? And, to make this matter worse, while with the one hand it surrenders this power to the President, on the other hand it usurps the power which belongs exclusively to the upper House of Congress.

Note the purpose of this bill—to carry into effect a treaty. Under the Constitution the right to make treaties is in the executive branch of the Government, subject to the approval by ratification of the upper House of Congress, and here this unconstitutional method of bringing about this legislation, which should have originated in the House, originates in the Executive, and from the Executive in the form adopted, the consent of the upper House alone being necessary. Due to the usurpation by the President of the powers of the House, we are led from one ridiculous position to another, and we find under that method of procedure that it becomes necessary for this House to usurp constitutional rights which exclusively belong to the upper House.

I have sought, as fully as the time allotted me would permit, to present two of the many objections to this bill. Having presented them as clearly as I can, I am willing to submit the matter to the determination of this House.

Mr. HEPBURN. Mr. Chairman, I thought the other day that the gentleman from Mississippi indulged in scant courtesy to the "blanket Indians who were striving to get back to the reservation," when he taunted them with what I thought he called desertion from their allies. [Laughter.] I suppose I am one of those blanket Indians. At all events I am seeking the reservation. [Laughter.] But I am not entitled to the taunt of the gentleman of having deserted my allies. The gentleman will remember that on last Saturday night the Democrats in this House indulged in a caucus, and we are told that in that caucus they hurried to announce to the world that whether the amendment they desired to this bill was attached to it or not they would vote for the bill. In view of that action, and that is the earliest action that any

party could have taken, I would like to know where the taunt of desertion belongs.

Mr. Chairman, I have intimated that I intend to vote for this bill, and yet I confess I do it with reluctance. I do it because the large majority of my associates seem to think that it is necessary, because the Administration very heartily approves of it, because the last Republican State convention of the State of Iowa declared in favor of it. Therefore I intend to vote for it, but I am not satisfied with the reasoning indulged in by gentlemen in support of it. I am not one of those who believe that we owe anything to Cuba. I did not know that it was contended, or it could have been contended, a little more than one hundred years ago, after the colonies had received much of assistance from the French monarchy, after our liberation, after the establishment of our Government, that because the French armies and French fleets were instrumental in securing our independence therefore we were entitled to great liberality in trade conventions with France. I know of no reason why we are indebted or why we owe anything to the Republic of Cuba. We have done much for them. We have spent three or four hundred millions of treasure, we have sacrificed many lives, in order that that little nationality might be relieved from oppression.

I believe in the doctrine of reciprocity, but I believe in Republican reciprocity. I believe in the reciprocity of McKinley, and I want now to say that that most estimable character has, in my judgment, been traduced and slandered by many men who have undertaken to repeat or to give signification to the last speech he ever uttered.

There is nothing in that speech from beginning to end that differs one iota from the well-established doctrines of the Republican party upon this question of reciprocity, namely, that the articles that are to be the subject of reciprocal arrangement and are to have advantages in our markets are to be the noncompetitive articles that will not interfere with our labor or with our industries. Let me read the concluding sentence in that speech on this subject, and it ought to quiet these gentlemen who are assiduous in their efforts to make it appear that William McKinley had recanted something in regard to his tariff views, that he had taken a back track, that he was on the way to Democratic free trade. The sentence of most importance in his speech is this:

We should take from our customers such of their products as we can use without harm to our industries and our labor.

That is what William McKinley said. What is there in that that gives encouragement to men who claim that the competitive article, the article that does harm to our industries or does harm to our labor, is to be the subject of reciprocal agreement?

Mr. Chairman, I believe in the system of protection as taught by the Republican party, and as illustrated by it in its legislation. And right here I want to say that in my judgment there is no Republican who claims that there is sanctity or sacredness in schedules, that they are written for all time, that they are to be permanent and unchanged. The Republican party has eight times entirely modified and changed the tariff and revised it. The tariff has been revised four times since I became a Member of this House—three times by the Republican party and once by the Democratic party. We recognize that changed conditions make changes in tariff rates essential, but we do cling to the protective principle, and I am glad to know that we can point to results. Mr. Chairman, we have had tariff regulations from the earliest days of the Republic.

For seventy-two years our tariffs were in the main written along the lines of Democratic policy—for seventy-two years. It is true we had a protective tariff, so called, in 1816, another in 1828, and another in 1842, but they were short-lived and were not protective as we understand that word now. They were along the lines, I say, of Democratic free trade, refusing protection to the labor or encouragement to the industries of the people of the United States. During those seventy-two years there were fifteen years where the balance of trade with foreign nations was in favor of the people of the United States, and the total of those balances in our favor were \$157,000,000. During fifty-seven years the balances were against us, and the aggregate of those balances were \$1,270,000,000.

When one stops to philosophize with regard to what this means, it is a matter of great concern that the balances should be so large against us, for it means that it became necessary that we by the export of our gold and our silver and our portable wealth should lose this immense sum of twelve hundred and seventy millions of dollars of our business capital, that would be so useful in our trade and commerce, and that our trade and commerce was thus curtailed by this useless and unnecessary exportation of our gold and silver and portable wealth. Our stocks, our bonds, State, national, and municipal, were carried abroad and we not only lost this capital, or the use of this capital, but we were constantly being drained of the sums necessary to pay the dividends and the interests on stocks and bonds. We were thus constantly made poorer.

When gold was discovered in California there were one hundred and fifty millions of gold that played its part in the circulating medium of the United States. During the first thirteen years after that discovery, and up to 1860, there was dug from the mines of California \$800,000,000, making a total of nine hundred and fifty millions of gold that ought to have been in the United States in 1860. As a matter of fact, there were but two hundred millions. Seven hundred and fifty millions of our gold had been exported from the United States to pay the balances that were due to foreign manufacturers because of the faulty systems of the Democratic party under the tariff of 1846 and the tariff of 1857.

That is the statement of the account, and we had in the United States in 1860 but four hundred and seven millions of circulating medium. The wealth of the United States at that time was sixteen billions of dollars. Eight generations of men had labored from the time of the settlement at Jamestown, eight generations of men had lived and died, and they had been able to accumulate in two hundred and fifty years as surplus only sixteen billions of dollars. Then we changed our policies. Instead of engaging simply in trade we began to make things, to create wealth, to encourage our own labor here, and at the end of forty years a little more than one generation of men had created eighty-six billions of wealth. [Applause on the Republican side.] They had added as their contribution to this wonderful amount seventy billions to the sixteen billions of the eight generations that had preceded them.

We began new policies then in 1860, and we have gone on perfecting and making better and better and better the tariff laws of the United States, until the nearest possible approach to perfection in that direction was reached in this body a little more than six years ago. What are some of the results of that? Think. What has been accomplished in a little more than six years? The balance of trade in our favor since the Dingley law went into effect has been thirty-two hundred and twenty-four millions of dollars. [Applause on the Republican side.] In seventy-two years of Democratic policies—practical free-trade policies—during the only years in which there were balances in our favor they amounted to one hundred and fifty seven million, but in the grand aggregate the sum against us was one billion and one hundred and odd millions of dollars—more than a billion of dollars against us; while in six years of time along our policies, under our legislation, the balances in our favor have been thirty-two hundred and twenty-four millions of dollars.

Instead of sending our portable wealth abroad to pay these balances the whole world is contributing to our wealth by sending their precious metals and their portable wealth to swell our riches. We have now in the United States, instead of a beggarly two hundred millions that were here when the Republican party took control of affairs, twelve hundred and seventy millions of gold. Instead of there being four hundred and seven millions of circulation we have now twenty-seven hundred and thirteen millions of circulation. In 1860 the manufactured products of the United States amounted to \$1,750,000,000; in 1902 they amounted to \$13,000,000,000. Under Republican policies these changes have come about.

In the old time, if a work of internal improvement was projected, the first thing to be done was to send envoys abroad to see whether the money could be borrowed, and we were one of the debtor nations, so it was said, and we often heard that taunt used that the United States was a debtor nation. Ah, the Republican party has changed all that. This is no longer a debtor nation. Men come here to borrow by the score of millions our gold. All of our great enterprises are now being financed at home. We have an abundance of money, we have an abundance of credit, we have an abundance of capital. These are some of the reasons why I am wedded to the Dingley tariff law and why I am unwilling that there should be assaults upon it, insidious or otherwise. I am one of those who, at least for the time being, is content to let well enough alone and refuse to go into new and untried experiments. [Applause on the Republican side.]

But, Mr. Chairman, these considerations, vast as they are, are but inconsiderable in comparison to the infinite good that comes to the people that have the wisdom to adopt a protective policy. Governments are instituted for the purpose of ameliorating the condition of men, of bringing more of happiness into the human heart, more of content into human families, and when we consider what this policy of the Republican party has accomplished in this direction in the elevation of the labor of the country, in making happy conditions for the labor of the country, it is inconceivable to my mind that gentlemen should cavil or sneer at our policies.

Mr. HUGHES of New Jersey rose.

The CHAIRMAN. Will the gentleman yield to the gentleman from New Jersey?

Mr. HEPBURN. I will be excused from yielding to the gentleman from New Jersey.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman declines to yield.

Mr. HEPBURN. Mr. Chairman, the Republican party was called into being in order to stand in front of an assault upon the dignity of labor. The Democratic party at that time was insisting that in a new State about to be created we should establish or recognize the doctrine that capital might own labor; that one man might own another man; that one man might sell another man and his wife and child, and that one man could drive with the lash of a master a man to unrequited labor. The Democratic party was insistent in establishing that doctrine over the State of Kansas, and the Republican party was called into being to resist that assault on humanity. [Applause on the Republican side.] It has been true, Mr. Chairman, to that first impulse. From that time of organization up to the present moment it has been the friend of labor. Every great measure that it has conceived or has carried into complete execution has had for its purpose, first and fundamental, the uplift of humanity, the betterment of mankind, the infusing of more of happiness into the homes of America. [Applause on the Republican side.]

I could go through the whole list of great achievements that this party has conceived and executed, and every one of them can be shown to have that direct purpose. I remember that a little while ago we were told that there were 3,000,000 men out of employment, men wandering through the streets and along the highways and byways, begging for places to work. I believe those stories were true. Mr. Chairman, do you remember the time when those stories were located? It was from 1893 to 1896, at a time when the Democratic party were trying anew the establishment of their policies of antiprotection. I can readily see how that might be.

The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GROSVENOR] yesterday showed us how it was that before the enactment of the law, before any overt act had been accomplished by the Democratic party, the mere existence of that party with the power to do evil, the very fact that it appeared as a menace, was sufficient to destroy that confidence in business that is absolutely essential to prosperity, and especially to the complete employment of our people. We saw the effect of it later on in this great multitude of idle men that were then called tramps. Do you hear anything of that now? There is labor in every part of this country for every man who wants a place to work. [Applause on the Republican side.] And there is a compensating wage for every man who will perform a day's labor. And it is in this direction, more than any other, that the wisdom of the Republican party is manifest and the beneficence of its policies is exhibited.

Mr. Chairman, this matter of labor is of very great importance to the people of the United States. There are twenty millions of men, women, and youths who are breadwinners in the United States. These men, women, and youths must have places in this labor field of ours. It is absolutely necessary if our institutions are to endure, if this Government of ours is to be perpetuated, if our social order is to be maintained. There must be made from year to year places in this labor field where every man who wants a place to work can find it, and a compensating wage. These men are the repositories of political power. They have it. It is theirs. Those who distributed political power within the United States did it with absolute impartiality and equality. One man has the same measure of political power that any other has. Some may have more of influence, some may have more of standing than others, but when it comes to the exercise of political power by the voter each one is given the same modicum; no less, no more. So that all political power—the power that makes constitutions and unmakes them, that writes laws and repeals them, that gives elements of value to property and takes them away—is in the hands of the laboring people of the United States.

Mr. Chairman, have you ever thought how many of the elements of value, of property, are the gift of legislation, coming directly from legislation? Why, the mere element of value, of ownership beyond immediate personal possession, is the gift of the law. The savage owns that which he seizes and holds. He lays down the object of his fancy and another seizes it and it is his. It is law, it is society, that lengthens the tenure of possession beyond the mere grasp of him who claims to own.

Mr. VANDIVER. Will my friend from Iowa permit a question?

Mr. HEPBURN. No; your friend from Iowa will not, I thank you.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman declines to yield.

Mr. HEPBURN. I do not want to be offensive; I only want to be emphatic. So it is with many other elements of value. The value that comes to property from just and equitable taxation is of immense importance. Where the right to tax attaches it is without limitation, and it depends upon society entirely that there is a freedom from confiscation or approximate confiscation. So it is with the right to bequeath, which is a gift of society. Society can take it away.

Now, I do not believe that there will ever, under any circumstances, at any time, be violence in revolution in this country. I do not believe that. There will be no guillotines, such as Paris saw. There will be no streets running with blood, such as were familiar scenes in 1793—nothing of that kind. When a revolution comes here because of discontent with our economic situation, it will be the quiet revolution of the ballot, and the assault will be directed against property and against these elements of the value of property that all recognize to be within the power of the ballot. We put an inheritance tax on our war-revenue bill a few years ago amounting to 15 per cent in some cases. We could have made it 100 per cent. We could have made it an escheat if we had seen fit. Ah, but some might say the Constitution would intervene. Who make constitutions in the United States? The men who cast the ballots.

I am not an alarmist. I am not a pessimist. I look to the bright side of life always. It is the hopeful features of the future that attract me, and yet I can not but believe that if I could not make a living in response to my endeavors as an honest laboring man—if I could not make that living for myself and my family, under laws and constitutions as they are, I would use the power that I had to produce changes that would be more beneficial to me, and I would look to the possibilities of simpler and easier methods of the distribution of surplus wealth. And so I believe my intelligent fellow-citizens will, if the time ever comes when, under the policies of the Government, we look to the support of people beyond the seas rather than to the interest and happiness of our own people—when, under the policies of Government, we look to the maintenance and enlargement of the labor fields of Europe rather than the labor fields of the United States.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. PAYNE. I yield ten minutes more to the gentleman.

Mr. HEPBURN. When that time comes then we may expect trouble; but under the policy of the United States, directed by the Republican party, this labor field is being enlarged, this labor field is made ample, the wage is compensating, there is comfort in the home, and there is no reason why so long as these policies obtain you or I should take pessimistic views of the future.

So I think, Mr. Chairman, I am right in the conclusion that I announced. That is not because we have now an abundant circulation, it is not because the balance of trade is in our favor, it is not because the people of other nations are sending their gold and their portable wealth to us in compensation for that which they buy from us, it is not for these reasons, but it is because the labor field of the United States is enlarged, because employment is more certain, because the wage is more surely compensating, because the homes are homes of plenty, and because contentment with our institutions finds lodgment in the hearts of all of our people that I support this protective policy of the Republican party. [Loud applause on the Republican side.]

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York is recognized.

Mr. SULZER. Mr. Chairman, the Cuban reciprocity bill, now under consideration in this House, is a step in the right direction, and I shall vote for it for that reason.

Let me say at the outset that I am in favor of reciprocity—not halfway reciprocity, not pretended reciprocity, but true, real reciprocity; Democratic reciprocity, that will accomplish something for the consumer; reciprocity that will mean something to our manufacturers; reciprocity that will continue to develop and build up our growing trade in a greater commercial way with all our neighbors on the Western Hemisphere and give us a more commanding trade position of a reciprocal character with Canada, Mexico, the West Indies, and the Central and South American States. We need the raw material and we want the products of these countries. They want our manufactured goods. True and honest reciprocity with them will benefit our manufacturers, help our consumers, and be of inestimable advantage to those countries and their industrious inhabitants. "Live and let live" should be our national motto regarding trade and commerce.

Reciprocity along these lines is true tariff reform, a bright harbinger of better commercial days, a firm step forward in the right direction, and the knitting together in closer ties of political friendship and more amicable trade relations of all the people in North and South America.

Let me say now that this bill is not perfect. It does not go far enough to meet my sanguine expectations. I indulged the hope of better things from the Republicans in this House, and believed that they would rise to the occasion, comply with the wishes of the great majority of the American people, meet the Cubans halfway, and deal fairly and honestly and justly with Cuba, so that true reciprocal trade relations would for all time be firmly established between the two Republics.

It is a matter, in my opinion, to be regretted, Mr. Chairman, that this bill can not now be amended and perfected by the real friends of reciprocity in this House who want to help Cuba

onward and upward, and at the same time benefit our manufacturers and consumers. But the political oligarchy that controls the proceedings in the House of Representatives has decreed otherwise, and we are compelled to take this bill with all its imperfections, with all its limitations, and with all its meager concessions, just as it is.

At the very beginning of this discussion the Committee on Rules, composed of three Republican Members of this House, brought in a cast-iron gag rule, which the majority adopted supinely and obsequiously, notwithstanding the earnest protest of every Democrat here assembled. The adoption of this rule makes it impossible for us to offer an amendment to this measure, and at the end of a few days' debate forces us to vote for or against the bill just as it came from the Ways and Means Committee. We are prevented from perfecting the bill. We are shut off from offering a single amendment. Any motion is quickly ruled "out of order," and we must take the bill or leave it, just as a few Republicans on the committee which reported it desire.

Such a proceeding is a travesty on intelligent legislation, violates all parliamentary precedent, and makes a farce of the popular branch of the lawmaking power.

I protest against this tyrannical rule. It makes the Members of this House mere automatons, legislation here a laughingstock, and representative government a stumbling-block. We have 338 Members in this House, and 385 of them by virtue of these gag rules are simply figureheads. We sit here day in and day out simply to vote now and then "yea" or "nay." We are the playthings of a legislative triumvirate. This Committee on Rules, composed of the Speaker, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DALZELL], and the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GROSVENOR], practically runs the House. These three Members are omnipotent—we propose and they dispose. That is about all there is to-day to the historic House of Representatives. We might as well stay home and delegate to the Committee on Rules the little privilege we have left, to cast our votes. The House of Representatives is no longer a deliberative body. It is the creature of this legislative triumvirate. We have no chance to construct legislation; no opportunity to perfect contemplated laws. If we have ability and desire to initiate and have considered legislation demanded by our constituents and the people generally, we can not do so. A minority Member has to-day no opportunity in this House, and a majority Member very little. No other parliamentary body in the world would tolerate the gag-act proceedings of the three Republican Members of the anomalous Committee on Rules. It is a disgrace to our manhood, an insult to our intelligence, an assault on our legislative rights, a blow to parliamentary government, and a perversion of the Constitution. How much longer shall we submit to it? How much longer shall this triumvirate continue? For one, I am tired of it. I cry out against it, and say it must be stopped. It can be stopped if we assert our rights and have the courage to maintain them.

Now, sir, I say this and I mean it—I shall continue to say it just so long as the Republican gag rule is enforced. I wanted to offer several amendments to this bill. In the first place, I wished to amend the bill by reducing the tariff tax one-half on all goods, wares, and merchandise going into Cuba from this country or coming into this country from Cuba. This bill proposes a reduction of 20 per cent of existing tariff taxes. I am in favor of a 50 per cent reduction. That would be little enough, and it would do some good and mean real reciprocity. Here is an opportunity to secure genuine reciprocity. I want to offer this amendment making the tariff-tax reduction 50 per cent instead of 20 per cent, as proposed in the bill, but the Republicans refuse to permit me to do it. Why? Because they fear it might be agreed to, and that, forsooth, would hurt some sheltered monopoly entrenched behind their high protective-tariff walls. How much longer will the American people be deceived by Republican hypocrisy regarding the tariff-made trusts?

In the second place, I intended to propose an amendment to the bill, striking out the differential and eliminating the color restriction now in the present law on sugar imported into this country from Cuba. If this were done, there would be no shelter to monopoly, competition in the manufacture of sugar would be free and untrammelled, and the price of sugar to the consumer materially reduced. Sugar is one of the necessities of life. Its price is one of the great items of household expenses to every family in the land. There is a tariff tax of about \$7 a barrel on sugar under the present law. This tax is a hunger tax. It is a Republican tariff tax. The consumer pays it. It should be repealed. There should be no tax on sugar. If this tax were taken off, the price of sugar in this country to the consumer would be reduced about one-half—quite an item of expense to every household. Here is an opportunity to give cheaper sugar to the consumers of our country, but the Republicans oppose it and decline to permit us to offer the amendment for fear it will be adopted. You are

afraid to go on record on this question. What a spectacle! The Democratic party is in favor of reducing taxes on the necessities of life. The Republican party is opposed to all tariff-tax reduction, even where the tariff shelters monopoly. No tinkering with the tariff is the mandate of the Republican party even where trust-made goods are sold by tariff-protected industries cheaper in foreign countries than at home. The tariff is a tax on consumption, and the consumer pays the tax. This high protective tariff question, which robs the many for the benefit of the few, is one of the leading issues between the Democratic and Republican parties, and will be submitted to the people in the next national campaign for their decision.

Another amendment, sir, I proposed to offer to this bill is to the effect that all goods, wares, and merchandise going into Cuba from the United States, or coming into this country from Cuba, shall be carried in American or Cuban ships—built in Cuba or the United States, carrying the American or the Cuban flag, and manned by Cuban or American sailors. If this amendment were adopted it would do something to aid the restoration of the American merchant marine. Republican policies have driven American ships and the American flag from the high seas.

Here is an opportunity, to some extent, to restore the flag to the ocean, but the Republicans refuse to permit me to offer the amendment. Why? Because the Republican Members would not dare to go on record in this House against restoring the American flag and American ships to the high seas. What a spectacle of commercial selfishness, monopolistic greed, and political shortsightedness the Republican party in this House presents to-day! The Republican Members of the House do not dare to go on record against these suggested amendments. They seek refuge in the gag rule of the legislative triumvirate, which protects them from going on record, and makes legislation in this House a sham and a farce. The Republicans are in the majority here. They are responsible to the people for this condition of affairs. The minority Members are precluded from offering a single amendment. We are compelled to vote for or against this bill just as it comes from the committee. It is an outrage, and I protest against it.

Notwithstanding the fact, Mr. Chairman, that I am prevented from offering the amendments I have referred to, it is my intention to vote for this bill on the theory that half a loaf is better than no bread, and that a step in the right direction is better than standing still. I believe that reciprocal commerce between this country and Cuba and Canada and our immediate neighbors in Central and South America should be as free and untrammelled as possible, consistent with the needs of revenue for economical governmental administration, and with a view of not disturbing honest industry or legitimate effort among our own producers and manufacturers. I trust the day is not far distant when we shall have reciprocity with the Dominion of Canada, with Mexico, with the West Indies, and with all the Central and South American Republics. We should make it to the interest of these countries to trade with us, and the self-interest established by reciprocal trade will ever constitute the strongest tie of lasting friendship, of permanent peace, and of material prosperity for all concerned.

Last spring, Mr. Chairman, I visited Cuba, and was greatly impressed by all I saw during my sojourn there. It is a genial land of sunshine and shadow—a veritable wonderland—rich in natural resources beyond the dreams of avarice. It is a great field for the man who wants to get on and succeed. No one need ever be hungry in Cuba. Her climate is ideal; her skies more beautiful than Italy's; her days an everlasting summer's dream; her air the most healthful in the world; her people generous, courteous, and hospitable; her valleys the garden of the Lord; her landscape so beautiful no painter can picture it and no poet adequately describe it. Cuba is the land of perpetual flowers, of stately royal palms, the Bohemia of the dreamer, generous in tropical fruits, the home for the painter and the poet, the paradise of all the islands of the sea—one long, harmonious, brilliant, indescribable mental melody. It will soon become the greatest winter resort in the world. As Mr. James Gordon Bennett said to me in Habana, in beauty, climate, and scenery, Cuba far surpasses the Riviera or any other part of the Mediterranean. I was impressed most favorably by everything I saw in Cuba. The climate so dreamy and so salubrious; the indescribable beauty of the magnificent scenery—odoriferous forever and a day with enchanting and entrancing perfumes; her vast undeveloped resources; the richness of the soil; her quaint towns and cities and villages resplendent in subdued colors of pale pink and lemon yellow and baby blue—remindful of the Orient—and full in every place with historical reminiscences bringing to memory myriads of patriotic thoughts and to recollection hundreds of heroic deeds from the days of Columbus to the present time. And then the quiet—the peaceableness of her people, so law-abiding and so

different from the helter-skelter turmoil, the nervous hurry, and the everlasting rush of the people of higher latitudes.

The Cubans have many problems to work out as the youngest Republic in the world, but destiny is with them and they will solve all difficulties of self-government successfully. I have no fears for the Republic of Cuba. It has taken its place among the nations of the earth, and success, happiness, contentment, and prosperity will ever follow its bright new flag; and the island country will as the years come and go become greater and grander and more glorious—a glad some demonstration that the Cubans are capable of self-government and have the ability to work out unaided and alone their own future.

Tomas Estrada Palma is making a splendid President of Cuba. He is the right man in the right place. His administration is giving general satisfaction among all the people throughout the island, and under his sagacious and patriotic guidance the Cuban Republic is moving along successfully and harmoniously. Great credit is due President Palma. He is Cuba's first, and will go into history as one of her greatest, Executives. He has the absolute confidence of everyone, and is doing an enormous work with a quiet heroism that commands respect and speaks more eloquently than words for Cuba's radiant future.

The Cubans welcome capital from the States to invest there and encourage in every way in their power northern progress and energy and enterprise. They know it is to their advantage. They realize its benefits. They see what Mr. Van Horne has accomplished in two years for their country. He has opened up Cuba's possibilities with a wand of magic, built and equipped a modern railroad from the west to the east, made Habana and Santiago walk hand in hand—sister provinces—added millions and millions of untold wealth to her values, made possible thousands and thousands of new homes and new towns, annihilated distance and made the Cubans, from one end of the island to the other, united and one. He has done and is doing a wonderful work for Cuba. No one who has not been there can fully conceive it. But the far-seeing Cubans fully appreciate it. Mr. Van Horne is today Cuba's pioneer of progress, the advance agent of her coming higher civilization, the helper of humanity, the guide of the coming generations, who blazes the trail through the primeval forests that happiness may follow his handiwork.

Mr. Chairman, let me reiterate what I have frequently said before on this floor, that I am now, always have been, and always will be the friend of Cuba. The RECORD will show that ever since I have been a Member of this House I have done all in my power for the Cuban people. I am glad the Cuban Republic has taken her place among the nations of the earth. May success, happiness, prosperity, and domestic tranquillity abide with her forever.

The time is at hand, nevertheless, when we must live up to our sacred obligations to Cuba. We granted her the freedom and the independence promised. We have launched this young Republic upon the ocean of nations, and said to all the world, Cuba is free and independent. We must say to every nation she is our creation—a daughter of the great Republic—and any interference with her will be an act unfriendly to the United States.

But that is not all. We must grant her immediate trade relief. In a commercial way she is at our mercy. This is not her fault—it is our fault. Congress has made it practically impossible for Cuba to market her products in other countries; they must be sold here, and they can not be sold in this country at present except at a loss, unless our tariff law is repealed or modified. This must be done at once—it should have been done months ago. The situation is serious and admits no further delay. The people want Congress to act, and our honor demands the immediate enactment of a liberal reciprocity law. We must keep our word—our faith is pledged.

The Republican party is responsible for this deplorable commercial condition. The Republican party, wedded to its high protective-tariff policy, would rather see the commercial destruction of Cuba than consent to reduce its present system of outrageous high-tariff taxes.

When the Congress adopted the so-called Platt amendment, which I am glad I voted against, and which, in my judgment, never should have been adopted, it took an unfair advantage of Cuba; but when the amendment finally became a law the Cubans accepted it in good faith, and at our request wrote it into their constitution. By virtue of that amendment Cuba is commercially at our mercy to-day and unable to make treaties of a commercial character with other nations. Under the circumstances it seems to me that it is now incumbent on this Government to grant trade relief to Cuba, so that her products can be admitted into this country and sold without a loss.

So, sir, I shall vote for this bill because I am in favor of doing something now for Cuba. I want to see Cuba prosperous. I will vote for any measure to reduce the present tariff duties between this country and Cuba. In my judgment we should have free

trade with Cuba. It would be beneficial to us and advantageous to the Cubans. It would help the people of both countries, commercially, financially, and politically. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. BENNY] is recognized for ten minutes.

Mr. BENNY. Mr. Chairman, in the course of his hour's talk yesterday the gentleman from Ohio—he who a day or two ago announced, in effect, his determination to defend the Administration against every attack made upon this floor, and who thus voluntarily assumed a burden which may prove too much for even his willing shoulders, unless this Administration speedily discontinues its ceaseless hunt for trouble—read what we were led to believe was a complete newspaper news item. I happened at the moment to have a copy of the same item in my pocket. It is taken from the New York American of November 16, 1903, and is as follows:

BERLIN, November 15.

The Frankfurter Zeitung's Constantinople correspondent says the Pennsylvania Steel Company has been awarded the contract for 20,000 tons of steel rails for the Mecca Railway, in competition with the Krupps and several other German and Belgian establishments.

Right here the gentleman from Ohio stopped, indicating that that was the end of the item. He neglected—purposely, of course—to read the remainder of it, consisting of only four lines, in these words:

The price is \$22.88 per ton delivered at Beirut.

The price of steel rails in the United States is \$28 per ton, which is the highest average price in ten years.

Why did he leave out these last four lines? Simply because he thought it better to withhold from the public gaze this additional evidence that the tariff-fattened steel trust can and does afford to manufacture its product in this country, ship it thousands of miles away, pay the freight upon the shipment, and then sell it in that far-off land at more than \$5 per ton below the price it exacts from its next-door neighbor in the United States. And when I asked him if the article from which he read also contained these omitted words, he stood with the article still in his hands. He knew well that the omitted words were there. He was caught, and knew he was, and knew that we knew it, but even then he declined to answer the question in the one word that would have answered it completely and truthfully: "Yes." But, looking round for a way in which he could jokingly turn the brunt of the situation aside, and failing to find it, he laboriously answered, "That is right, I suppose." What a monumental conclusion, and what tremendous reasoning power he must have exerted in arriving at it!

And while still in the fervor naturally following this mental effort the gentleman asked me this question:

Now, if the gentleman gets the floor at some point of time, not necessarily in this debate, but at any time during this Congress, will he tell me in an official manner how much harm has been done to the people of the United States by breaking into that monopoly of the Krupps on the other side of the water and selling steel rails even at a price lower than they can be afforded for?

The gentleman assumes that what he calls the Krupp monopoly was broken into by the steel monopoly of the United States selling these steel rails at a price so low that no profit was made therefrom.

What a farce! The American trust sold these rails at \$22.88 per ton delivered at Beirut. Deducting \$5 estimated freight rate per ton and the price to the trust is then \$17.88 per ton. Is that "less than they can be afforded for?" Has not Mr. Charles M. Schwab himself, the president of the steel trust, put the cost of production of steel rails at less than \$12 per ton in the United States and about \$19 per ton in England?

In the United States Steel Corporation's financial statement of 1903, as contained in Moody's Manual of Corporation Securities for 1903, at page 1706, we find that this one corporation for the year 1902 produced 1,920,786 tons of steel rails; that its total production of all articles was 8,197,232 tons in the same year, while its net earnings during that year were \$133,308,763.72.

Does the gentleman from Ohio believe this Pennsylvania steel company is selling 20,000 tons of steel rails at a loss? Was it by selling their more than 8,000,000 tons total output at a loss that the United States Steel Corporation made net earnings last year of above \$133,000,000—more than \$16 per ton?

Is it not fair to assume that Mr. Schwab's figures are correct? If so, then this sale of steel rails to be delivered at Beirut carries a profit of about \$11 per ton, less the freight charges to that Syrian port. If we estimate that freight charge, as before, at \$5 per ton, there still remains a net profit of \$6 per ton, which, based upon the output of steel rails by the United States Steel Corporation for last year, would yield that company an annual profit on steel rails alone of \$11,524,716.

I stated yesterday that the harm done to the American purchaser of these steel rails is the difference between \$22.88 and \$28 per ton. That is too low. Since the trust here sold those rails at

\$22.88 per ton delivered at Beirut we should deduct from that the \$5 per ton estimated freight charge to be paid by the trust, which leaves \$17.88 per ton as the net price to the trust. American consumers are paying for the same material \$28 per ton, a difference of \$10.12 a ton in favor of the purchaser in foreign lands. At that rate, and estimating the consumption of steel rail in the United States this year at the total output of these rails for 1902 in this country, viz, 2,872,909 tons, the "harm" this year to American consumers of that particular product will amount to \$29,073,839.08. The "harm" to American consumers of other products, handled in the same way by other trusts, is beyond computation. Does the gentleman from Ohio mean that breaking into the Krupp monopoly on the other side of the water by the American trust has benefited the people there? If so, will he not admit that by removing the duty upon steel rails of \$7.84 per ton and assisting in the "breaking into" the steel trust here our own people would be benefited?

Are we to infer from the gentleman's remarks that extortion in this country is not wrong if practiced on the railroads that purchase steel rails? The Democratic position is that, without regard to whom it is practiced on, extortion is always wrong, and when permitted and encouraged by our laws is a political crime. The Republican party fosters these combinations and enables them to force from our people an exorbitant price for their articles of daily need, a price much in excess of that at which these same articles are sold by these same combinations in the various foreign markets of the world.

This does not refer to steel rails alone, but to many articles and at varying percentages of difference in their home and export prices, some of which are contained in the following table:

Export and home prices.

Article and description.	Export price.	Home price.	Percent of difference.
Acetylene-gas generator, Colt, 10 light.....each.....	\$40.00	\$55.00	37
Ammunition caps:			
BB round.....per 1,000.....	1.03	1.49	43
Central fire, .32 long, Colt.....do.....	6.48	9.00	40
Rim fire, .22 long.....do.....	2.16	3.00	39
Primed shells, .22 short.....do.....	.72	1.53	112
Axle grease, snow flake (gallon cans).....dozen.....	4.50	5.40	20
Borax, city refined.....pound.....	.024	.074	210
Carbide, lump.....ton.....	55.00	70.00	27
Chucks:			
Skinner's standard drill, No. 100.....each.....	3.09	4.90	58
Skinner's independent lathe, F, 12-inch.....each.....	15.88	24.00	51
Union Manufacturing Co., independent, No. 18, 10-inch.....each.....	10.20	16.60	63
Union Manufacturing Co., face-plate jaws, No. 48, 8-inch, 4 set.....do.....	23.52	39.00	66
Coffee and spice mills, Enterprise, each.....	40 and 2 p. ct.	25 to 30 p. ct.	20
Fruit presses, Enterprise, No. 46.....each.....	8.82	11.00	25
Harness snaps, Covert's:			
Trojan loop, 14-inch.....gross.....	2.40	3.23	35
Derby loop, 1-inch.....do.....	1.68	2.24	33
Yankee roller, 14-inch, XC breast strap.....do.....	1.00	1.37	37
Lead, pig.....100 pounds.....	2.00 to 2.50	3.974	58 to 38
Meat choppers:			
Enterprise, No. 5.....each.....	.75	1.04	39
Enterprise, No. 10.....do.....	1.14	1.56	37
Enterprise, No. 22.....do.....	1.51	2.08	38
Enterprise, No. 32.....do.....	2.25	3.12	38
Nails, cut, 20d. to 60d.....100 pounds.....	1.80	2.05	13
Nails, wire, base price.....do.....	1.30	2.05	58
Oil-well supplies.....do.....			
Piano, Bradbury.....each.....	225.00	275.00	18
Playing cards, United States Playing Card Co.....gross.....	12.35	25.65	108
Powder:			
Duck, in can.....pound.....	.374	.45	20
Duck, in 25-pound kegs.....do.....	.244	.32	30
Indian rifle, in 25-pound kegs, FFFg, etc.....pound.....	.114	.16	37
Seeders, raisins and grapes, Enterprise.....do.....	40 and 5 p. ct.	25 to 30 p. ct.	30
Rakes, malleable-iron shanks:			
10-inch.....dozen.....	1.18	1.50	27
12-inch.....do.....	1.28	1.60	25
14-inch.....do.....	1.39	1.75	26
16-inch.....do.....	1.50	1.85	23
Sadiron, BB, in cases.....pound.....	24 to 34	34 to 44	25
Sausage stuffers, Enterprise.....do.....	40 and 2 p. ct.	25 to 25 and 74	20
Saws, Disston & Sons:			
Band—			
24-inch, gauge 18.....foot.....	.21	.34	62
10-inch, gauge 18.....do.....	1.25	1.54	23
Butchers'—			
No. 7, 24-inch.....doz.....	8.50	10.22	20
Hand—			
No. 12, 24-inch.....do.....	14.82	18.04	22
No. 16, 24-inch.....do.....	11.97	14.57	22
No. 107, 24-inch.....do.....	10.83	12.30	13
Sewing machines:			
Domestic, No. 1.....each.....	13.25	20.00	59
Domestic, No. 4 or 9.....do.....	17.48	25.00	43

Export and home prices—Continued

Article and description.	Export price.	Home price.	Per cent of difference.
Shovels:			
Baxter, sock strap.....dozen.....	\$5.83 to 6.53	\$7.50 to 8.40	29
Rowland, plain back.....do.....	5.12 to 5.83	6.75 to 7.00	29
Thomas, c. s. b. st's.....do.....	4.19 to 4.95	5.40 to 6.30	29
Tin plates, Bessemer.....100 pounds.....	3.19	4.19	31
Typewriters, Remington and others.....each.....	55.00 to 65.00	100.00	54 to 82
Wire, barb:			
Galvanized.....100 pounds.....	2.25	2.90	29
Painted or varnished.....do.....	1.83	2.60	40
Wire, plain, fencing, varnished.....do.....	1.85	2.00	48
Wire, plain galvanized:			
Gauge 4 to 9.....do.....	1.54	2.70	75
Gauge 10 to 11.....do.....	1.62	2.97	83
Gauge 12.....do.....	1.76	3.10	76
Gauge 13 to 14.....do.....	1.81	3.37	85
Gauge 15 to 16.....do.....	2.08	3.78	81
Gauge 17.....do.....	2.46	4.05	65
Gauge 18.....do.....	2.63	4.32	64
Rubber, insulated.....do.....	25 p. ct. off for export.		
Steel armor, for cables.....pound.....	3.75	4.15	11
Wire rope:			
1 inch circumference.....100 feet.....	.72	2.60	261
Galvanized, 24 inches circumference.....100 feet.....	3.12	9.70	211

a Cheaper in Russia than in United States.

The gentleman from Ohio asks, "Who cares what they get, then, for steel rails (in foreign markets)." Nobody here need care very much about how much or how little any trust gets in foreign markets for anything it produces here, except for the pleasure Americans feel in the success of Americans abroad; but when we see these trusts selling at a profit in foreign lands the things produced by them in the United States at very much lower prices than they sell these same articles here for it is time we stop and ask, "Why and how is this done?" And when we find that the Republican party has so manipulated our laws as to permit the people of this land to be robbed by this system of extortion it is our duty to call attention to it, and to do what we can to stop it.

The gentleman observes—

This is the first time I have ever heard a Democrat solicitous about railroads in the purchase of steel rails.

Let him not be alarmed. We do not propose to encroach upon the hunting preserves of his party. Our position is that a railroad company is just like any other corporation. It should be treated fairly and compelled in turn to treat the people fairly. In opposition to the position assumed by him for his party, we do not believe that a railroad company in the United States, or any other company or person, should be robbed, with the assistance of our laws or by the laxity, or worse, of officials chosen to execute those laws, even by a stronger robber. We consider that the railroad companies should be prevented from assisting any concern—the Standard Oil Company, for instance—in injuring or even putting a rival out of business by giving such concern a preferential freight rate, and I for one believe in removing from the power of the railroad companies and other corporations the courts of our States and of the United States, so that no suggestion by the men who control these companies to the appointing power in State or nation can result in the attorney of the company being elevated to the bench, and I believe, further, that the railroad companies of the land ought not to be permitted to take the part in politics that some of them do. When our friend on the other side and the politicians of his party join us in that there will be no further necessity for Republican protection to the fugitive ex-governor against the efforts of the State of Kentucky to compel his return to his own State to stand trial for the crime of murder by assassination.

The real important point in the news item which the gentleman read in garbled form is the evidence again presented to the people that Republican favoritism to certain infant industries, that have grown so big and strong on the tariff milk of Republican kindness that they now make a pastime of chastising their parent and our whole citizenship, has resulted in decreasing the price of their production to the foreigner, while relatively, and in many instances specifically, increasing the price to the home consumer.

But the gentleman from Ohio retorts:

I will say to the gentleman that to-day there stands upon the books of the various steel-rail manufacturers of this country (and I have the evidence of it here in my hand) orders for more steel rails than ever were put upon the books of the manufacturers of rails in this country during all the administrations of the Democratic party in the United States put together.

And in the face of this statement of his as to this tremendous increase of business on hand, the Ohio patriarch has the audacity to suggest that the steel trust still hunts for unprofitable contracts for the delivery of steel rails on the other side of the world for

more than \$6 per ton below the price for which they sell at New York.

Most wonderful suggestion of the country's prosperity by the gentleman! Follow it out logically a little further. God's green fields in these United States were favored last year by the sun and the rain of heaven, so that with an increased acreage planted more food stuffs were raised than in any year of any Democratic Administration. Then all credit to the Republican party! More deaths in the United States last year than in any other year of our country's existence. Down with Democracy! And in this fair land last year there were more men and maidens joined in wedlock, and more babies born into the world to make it better, brighter, and happier, than in any year under Democratic rule. Should not the credit for that be given to the Republican party, and to the great man of race-suicide fame now at the head of it?

Oh, ye men of the majority who have appropriated to yourselves all credit for every good thing which has happened in our country, forget your self-conceit long enough to give some credit where that credit is due, and to take home to yourselves once again the beautiful words of the old Doxology—

Praise God from whom all blessings flow,
Praise Him all creatures here below,
Praise Him ye heavenly host,
Praise Father, Son, and Holy Ghost.

Mr. WATSON. Mr. Chairman, like the distinguished gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HEPBURN] who has just addressed the committee, I, too, am a protectionist, and in my advocacy of the pending measure I abate not one jot or tittle from my devotion to that cardinal doctrine in the Republican creed, for I regard the protective tariff principle as fundamental in the Republican party—protection to American labor wheresoever employed, and to American capital wheresoever invested. I am glad that the eloquent gentleman from Iowa spoke of the relations of the Republican party to labor in the days gone by. In truth, Mr. Chairman, it can be said that the Republican party in its history has gone through three periods with reference to labor. The first was the enfranchisement of labor on our own soil and under our own flag. The second was the protection of that labor thus enfranchised from the underpaid and underfed labor of other countries in the world, and the third bringing about such conditions that that enfranchised and protected labor can go forth and capture the unlimited markets of the world.

WHAT IS PROTECTION?

Mr. Chairman, it is well for us on this side of the House, at the very outset, to determine what is the proper definition of protection. It is a well-known principle of logic that there can be no discussion between two persons on opposite sides of a controversy unless they stand upon some common ground, unless they come to some agreement as to the meaning of terms. What, therefore, is a protective tariff? For definitions are always fundamental. As I conceive it, the protective tariff of Lincoln and of Blaine and of McKinley means that we shall place a tariff on all those products of other countries coming into our country the like of which we either do or can produce in sufficient quantities to supply the home demand.

But, says one of my friends from Michigan, can we not with proper encouragement produce enough sugar to supply the home demand? We most surely can, Mr. Chairman, and that would bring sugar within the definition that I have above given. What justification, then, is there for any Republican believing in the fundamental principle of protection, as I have defined it, voting for this reduction of 20 per cent? Only this: That the sugar schedule is so high that this 20 per cent reduction on Cuban sugar alone will not injuriously affect that great industry in this country. That, and that alone, is my justification for supporting this measure, for if I believed that this 20 per cent reduction on Cuban sugar would for one moment injuriously affect any industry in this Republic it should have neither my voice nor my vote. I believe in the fundamental principle of protection to American industries, as enforced by the Republican party for forty years.

THIS LEGISLATION WILL NOT INJURE AMERICAN PRODUCER.

Now, Mr. Chairman, what reason have I for believing that this 20 per cent reduction on Cuban sugar will not injuriously affect the production of sugar in the United States? First, because the introduction of that sugar at that rate will not lower the price of that commodity in the United States, and if it does not lower the price in the United States it can not affect those who raise sugar. In examining the hearings before the Committee on Ways and Means in the last Congress with reference to this subject, much valuable information can be obtained, and I find among other things the testimony of Mr. Oxnard before that committee to be very appropriate. I read from that testimony:

Mr. McCLELLAN. If the duty on raw sugar is reduced between Cuba and the United States, what will be the effect upon the price of refined sugar?

Mr. OXNARD. Will you state what reduction?

Mr. McCLELLAN. We will state first, free raw sugar.
Mr. OXNARD. It will be imperceptible.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Then a reduction of less than that would affect the price still less?

Mr. OXNARD. I said I did not think it would affect it hardly any to the consumer; I do not believe it would.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Say there was a reduction of 50 per cent, would that practically have any effect?

Mr. OXNARD. Not to the consumer, in my opinion.

Mr. METCALF. We allowed Hawaiian sugar to come in free in 1876, did we not?

Mr. OXNARD. Yes, sir.

Mr. METCALF. Did that result in a reduction of the price to the consumer?

Mr. OXNARD. No.

Mr. METCALF. Who received the benefit?

Mr. OXNARD. The refiners and the Hawaiian planters, but exactly in what proportion they got it I do not know; but the consumer got absolutely no benefit of the reduction of raw sugar from the Hawaiian Islands.

Of course, if the consumer in this country got the benefit of this reduction it could not possibly result in any benefit to the Cuban planter; but it can not possibly lower the price to the consumer, and can not, therefore, affect the producer.

Doctor Wiley gave his testimony in the hearings before the Ways and Means Committee. He says:

I myself have long been a believer in lower and yet remunerative prices for sugar, and have stated that the amount of sugar produced in Porto Rico, the Philippines, and Cuba in 1899-1900 could be introduced duty free without danger to our own industry. * * * As a prophet, I have looked forward to the time when the cost of making refined sugar would not be quite 3 cents a pound in this country, and when, with fair profits to farmers, makers, and factory, it would go on the consumer's table at less than 4 cents a pound.

In that same hearing Doctor Wiley refers approvingly to his testimony before the Industrial Commission, in which he said:

Mr. CONGER. How about the Philippine Islands as a place for the sugar industry?

Doctor WILEY. I know less about them than Cuba.

Mr. CONGER. Is it your idea that those engaged in this beet-sugar industry need have no fear of the effect of their being included?

Doctor WILEY. Absolutely none. When the Spanish war commenced and my friends commenced to write to me these despairing letters that we were going to be ruined by free sugar, I never for a moment had any fear. If we to-day were to admit absolutely free from duty every pound of sugar made in Porto Rico and Cuba and the Philippines, it would not affect the progress of our sugar-beet industry in this country.

We will consume in the United States this year approximately 2,500,000 tons of sugar, not more than 950,000 tons of which will come to us from Cuba. The price of this staple commodity is fixed at Hamburg, because Germany is its greatest producer and exporter. Every student of economics understands, therefore, that a 20 per cent reduction on the amount we import from Cuba can not possibly affect the price in this land; and if it does not lower the price it can not affect the producer.

And so we are warranted in believing that this introduction of Cuban sugar at a reduction of 20 per cent would not injuriously affect the sugar-producing industry in this Republic, because it would not lower the price of sugar in this Republic.

But what else? I believe that Cuban sugar can not successfully compete with beet sugar in either Chicago or Kansas City, which are the principal markets for beet sugar in this country; and if I had time I would read from the hearings of the Ways and Means Committee evidence which seems to me absolutely conclusive on this fundamental proposition.

The cost of 100 pounds of Cuban sugar f. o. b. at Habana is \$2. The freight to New York is 9 cents per 100 pounds. The duty, after a 20 per cent reduction—the duty being 1.685 now—would be 1.348. The cost of refining is known by all to be 0.625 for every hundred pounds, without any profit to the refiner. The freight to Chicago is 29 cents a hundred. So that to land 100 pounds of Cuban sugar already refined in the market in Chicago would cost exactly \$4.35 a hundred, and to land it in Kansas City, the freight from New York to Kansas City being 36½ cents, would cost \$4.42 a hundred. Now, I might go on and read the testimony of various gentlemen who are interested in the production of beet sugar in the United States to show that under no circumstances can it cost that much to place American beet sugar in competition with this Cuban sugar in the market of Chicago or in the market at Kansas City; but the evidence of a few on this point will suffice. I may say, before quoting, that I have not been able to obtain later reliable data upon this question, but I assume that the conditions are at least as favorable for the American producer now as when these statements were made a year ago.

N. H. Stewart, president of the Kalamazoo Beet Sugar Company, when before the committee, made the following statements:

Coming to the cost of manufacturing sugar in Michigan, it costs \$5.20 for 1 ton of beets; \$1.06, cost of supplies per ton of beets; \$1.51, cost of labor for entire year per ton of beets; \$1.00, cost of repairs and depreciation per ton of beets; 61 cents, cost of interest, insurance, and taxes per ton of beets; 6.3 cents, cost of selling sugar per ton of beets. This makes a total cost per ton of beets of \$9.833; total cost per 100 pounds of refined sugar, \$4.682.

The above estimate includes 5 per cent interest on the total capital invested and 7 per cent annual depreciation on the value of the plant. Leaving out these two items, the cost of manufacturing each 100 pounds of refined sugar is reduced \$0.671, or to \$4.011.

To this sum should be added 13 cents a hundred pounds, the

freight charge from Kalamazoo to Chicago, so that it would cost the Michigan producer of beet sugar \$4.141 to land 100 pounds of his product in the Chicago market, while it would cost \$4.35 for the Cuban planter to do the same thing.

W. L. Churchill, president of the Bay City Beet Sugar Company, stated:

The succeeding year, which would be 1900-1901, we had learned a little more about our business. The first year we were in the kindergarten class. We got out of that into the A B C class. Then we produced sugar for \$3.96 per hundred pounds. I want you to bear in mind all the time that the farmer comes in and is a great factor in this matter. We paid the farmer \$2.51 for the sugar contained in the beet as he delivered it to our bins.

The CHAIRMAN. I am a little anxious to know how you came out the next year.

Mr. CHURCHILL. I am frank to say, gentlemen, that I have not a full, detailed statement that I can make to you in regard to this year; but I can assure you that we will make sugar this year at a cost of not to exceed \$3.60 or \$3.75 per hundred pounds.

The CHAIRMAN. You think it will be between those figures?

Mr. CHURCHILL. Yes.

Assuming that the freight rate is 13 cents a hundred, it would cost that company not to exceed \$4.05 to lay down 100 pounds of its product in the Chicago market, as against \$4.35 for the Cuban planter, a difference in favor of the home product of 30 cents a hundred, a difference great enough to lift the Michigan grower above the possibility of harm from his dusky competitor.

Francis K. Carey, president of the National Sugar Manufacturing Company, of Sugar City, Colo., gives the freight rate from Sugar City to Kansas City and common points as 25 cents per 100, and the cost of producing beet sugar in Colorado as follows:

My opinion is that during the first campaign our sugar cost us all the way from 7 to 9 cents, according to what you allow for depreciation, what you call betterments, and what you call operating expenses, and whether you do or do not allow interest on the cost of the investment. I think that for the first two campaigns we will manufacture between nine and ten million pounds of sugar, at an average cost of about 5½ cents a pound.

When we get through our third campaign, I think the total sugar manufactured for the three years will not have cost us over 4 cents. In making this last calculation I am estimating on the future; but I am anxious to make it plain that I believe the cost of sugar in Colorado under normal conditions, which we will sooner or later have surrounding our factory, ought not to be over 3 cents a pound, and I am not afraid to say that I will some day manufacture it for less than that sum. If I had not thought so, I would not have invested my own money or the money of my friends in the industry in Colorado. In other words, I think Colorado is the natural place to produce sugar for consumption in America. It is not a case of "protecting bananas grown under glass." If I am mistaken in my belief that sugar can be grown in Colorado for 3 cents or less, I am free to admit that I have no standing before this committee and have no right to ask for the protection of my industry.

COST OF MAKING BEET SUGAR IN UTAH.

Thomas R. Cutler, president of the Utah Sugar Company, shows that the beet-sugar industry of Utah has nothing to fear from Cuban competition. He gives the average cost to his company of refined beet sugar for five years as follows: 1897, \$4.51 per hundred; 1898, \$4.46; 1899, \$3.55; 1900, \$3.55; 1901, \$3.42. The average cost of producing sugar for these five years was \$3.86 per hundred, and the average selling price has been \$5.76 net, or a clear profit of \$1.90 per hundred.

These figures show conclusively that there need be no fear on the part of the American sugar grower that his industry will be injured by this legislation, but, rather, with the assurance given him by the provisions of this act that no further reduction in the tariff on sugar will be made for five years, he may feel encouraged to prosecute his work with renewed vigor and renewed hope.

I commend to students of this subject the careful study of the hearings before the Ways and Means Committee on this proposition, and also the exhaustive and convincing speech of Hon. CHESTER I. LONG—now a Senator from Kansas, then a member of the Ways and Means Committee—when the same subject was before the House in the last Congress.

And so my justification for voting for this measure, Mr. Chairman, is the fact that it can not injuriously affect the production of beet sugar in the United States. For, as my friend the honorable chairman of the committee [Mr. PAYNE] has remarked, and as Mr. (now Senator) LONG of Kansas remarked, and as Mr. (now Senator) DOLLIVER of Iowa remarked, the sugar schedule was placed comparatively high in the Dingley law in order to afford trading stock in the future for reciprocity purposes; and so I believe, and I believe most profoundly, that the importation of this amount of sugar at a 20 per cent reduction can not in any wise affect the production of sugar in the United States. If I thought it would, it should not have my vote, because I stand by the ancient faith of the Republican party, protection, as outlined in all of the platforms of that great organization.

Furthermore, it may be said, in passing from this branch of the subject, that even after the proposed reduction of 20 per cent the rate on sugar will still be about 65 per cent, which is higher than the tariff rate on any other import save alone tobacco, the average rate on all importations being a little under 49 per cent, so that there is no cause for undue alarm at the prospect of the passage of this bill.

WHAT IS RECIPROCITY?

Mr. Chairman, much has been said recently in regard to reciprocity in competitive products. I do not believe there is such a thing as reciprocity in competitive products. In my opinion, reciprocity in competitive products means free trade. If there be any reciprocity it must be, in effect, an exchange of unlike products under the most favorable conditions. Let us take, for instance, a very homely illustration. Suppose my honorable friend from Missouri [Mr. CLARK] manufactures nails and I am engaged in manufacturing the same product. As between us there can be no reciprocity, there must be nothing but keen competition. But if the gentleman is engaged in producing sugar and I am engaged in manufacturing nails, there might be some reciprocity between us; there might be some reciprocal agreement made between us. But reciprocity must be in unlike products. I do not believe in the idea of reciprocity in competitive products, because reciprocity in competitive products, in its last analysis and carried to its logical conclusion, must mean free trade, nothing more and nothing less.

My friend from Iowa has already called attention to the fact that McKinley has been misquoted. Let us see what McKinley said:

By sensible trade arrangements, which will not interrupt our home production, we shall extend the outlets for our increasing surplus.

Which will not interrupt home production! That, to my mind, precludes utterly the idea of reciprocity in competitive products, unless, as in this instance, the schedule is sufficiently high to enable us to make the reduction without seriously affecting the home product, and unless the schedule is sufficiently high for that purpose there can be no legitimate reciprocity.

What else did he say?

We should take from our customers such of their products as we can use without harm to our industries and labor.

Can that mean competition? Can that mean reciprocity in competitive products? I can not believe it.

And so, speaking for myself, Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I want it understood once for all that voting for this reciprocity agreement does not bind me, nor shall I consider it obligatory upon me in the future, to vote for any reciprocity agreement in competitive products because of these words of the great McKinley. I believe in reciprocity where we can have reciprocity in coffee or in tea, or in those things the like of which we do not produce in this country, and can not with sufficient encouragement produce in this country; but if we can produce them in this country we ought to. If we can raise them in this country we ought to. We ought to do our own work. [Applause on the Republican side.] That is the fundamental principle of protection. Then I am in favor of passing this bill because it in no wise interferes with the protective tariff. I am in favor of passing it because it does not affect injuriously a solitary American industry. I am in favor of it because it will enable us to secure a trade with Cuba of from one hundred and fifty million to two hundred million dollars per year. I am in favor of it because it will do full justice to a struggling people. I am in favor of it because I believe that our moral obligation—taking away the commercial and the industrial idea connected with it and putting it upon high ethical grounds—I believe that our moral obligation is such that we are in conscience and in duty bound to pass this bill.

NOT A ONE-SIDED MEASURE.

What has Cuba to offer in exchange for this proposed reduction? As the chairman of the committee has so well said, "This is not a one-sided proposition, but, instead, a real reciprocal agreement."

I shall not go into detail in this regard, but content myself by inserting a table showing the trade between this country and Cuba before reciprocity with that island was established by the McKinley bill, while it was in operation, and after its repeal by the Democratic party.

Imports into the United States from Cuba.

[Years ending June 30.]

Principal articles.	1890.	1893.	1896.	1901.
Total (all articles).....	\$53,801,591	\$78,706,506	\$40,017,730	\$43,423,088
Sugar.....	35,420,504	60,637,631	24,102,835	26,373,690
Molasses.....	3,679,078	1,081,064	128,474	891,176
Leaf tobacco.....	7,106,233	8,940,068	10,613,468	9,894,849
Cigars, cigarettes, etc.....	3,967,955	2,766,502	2,078,275	2,301,949
Fruits and nuts.....	1,795,886	2,389,523	1,178,904	911,561
Vegetables.....	39,049	67,042	40,265	31,002
Hides and skins.....	283,627	279,153	184,281	19,765
Wood, unmanufactured.....	515,020	1,071,593	590,942	810,328
Iron ore.....	566,417	641,943	521,310	573,414
Asphalt, etc.....	27,492	25,992	7,628	19,162

Exports from the United States to Cuba.
[Years ending June 30.]

Principal articles.	1890.	1893.	1896.	1901.
Total (all articles)	\$13,084,415	\$24,157,698	\$7,530,880	\$25,964,801
Bacon and hams	550,801	1,317,829	734,540	1,070,436
Lard	2,233,821	4,023,917	1,551,185	2,811,096
Wheat flour	1,164,538	2,821,557	647,067	2,080,129
Corn	253,775	582,050	93,201	817,327
Total breadstuffs	1,520,617	3,512,207	774,792	3,180,232
Vegetables	322,355	978,261	388,792	624,970
Dairy products	53,098	128,098	81,440	455,553
Oil, crude and refined	595,711	514,808	348,745	509,539
Animals	12,820	29,411	121,881	2,079,918
Agricultural implements	126,492	130,341	36,826	105,397
Iron and steel, and manufac- tures of	2,709,804	6,691,929	769,356	3,800,385
Cars, carriages, etc	262,829	537,616	46,874	633,511
Coal	722,856	931,571	613,411	1,004,341
Cotton manufactures	140,318	143,182	63,834	386,037
Leather, and manufactures of	194,530	181,476	75,481	474,329
Paper, and manufactures of	205,779	159,865	69,314	240,004
Wood, and manufactures of	1,208,476	1,881,065	490,396	1,539,355

A careful study of this table will show that reciprocity with Cuba then caused our export trade to that island to almost double. Why will it not do so now? That it caused our imports from that island to advance \$25,000,000 then. Why will it not do so now?

Our total trade with her in 1890, both imports and exports, amounted to \$66,886,006. Under the beneficent influence of McKinley reciprocity, such as is proposed in the pending measure, it sprang to \$102,864,204, an increase of \$35,978,198. When the blighting hand of Democracy was laid upon the McKinley law and our reciprocity agreement with Cuba destroyed, our trade with her decreased from \$102,864,204, in 1893, to \$47,548,610, in 1896, or a reduction of \$55,305,594.

What reason have gentlemen for asserting that reciprocity with Cuba will not work so well again? Why should we not by this means secure control of the entire trade of that island? Why should we not bind these people to us by commercial ties? By the Platt amendment we assumed much of responsibility for the future conduct of that island, and we should honestly endeavor to make our aims her aims, our hopes her hopes, and so weld the two nations together that our duty shall be the more easily discharged.

LET THE TARIFF ALONE.

But, say our Democratic friends, shall we never revise the tariff, Mr. Chairman, that question is not legitimately before us now, but, unfortunately, our Democratic friends have not been discussing the pending measure. The gentleman from New York [Mr. SULZER], who has just taken his seat, complained because he had listened to this discussion for four days and had heard nothing about the bill before the House. That is true. But who compelled this discussion? The Democrats, not the Republicans, compelled it. We were willing three days ago to take a vote on this proposition, but they wanted to debate and they wanted to discuss and they wanted to harangue for the purpose of confusing, of befogging, of throwing dust. They wanted to talk about free trade, to talk about a revision of the tariff, and all that sort of thing. Well, shall we revise the tariff now? Mr. Chairman, is there any reason why it should be done at this particular time? No. We are doing well, the best any nation ever did in all the history of the world. Let us keep on doing well under the same old idea. [Applause on the Republican side.] We are to-day the most prosperous people on the face of the earth, and I shall not recite facts and figures, because we know that in and of ourselves. Let us keep on letting well enough alone.

Ah, but my friend from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS] said that we worshiped tariff schedules, that we had made the schedules of the McKinley bill a fetish before which we bowed down and worshiped, and that we did homage to all the various schedules. Not at all. How can we improve the present bill? I admit that it has many inconsistencies and many incongruities, and some of its schedules might be changed. But how can we get a better bill? Where is there a better bill? Why, in the mind of the gentleman from Mississippi. But, unfortunately, the tariff bill which exists in his mind has no force extraterritorially.

Why, the gentleman from New York has a tariff bill in his mind, and the gentleman from Connecticut, from the same committee, has a tariff bill in his, but the two gentlemen do not agree. Now, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS] has a perfect tariff bill in his mind, and the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. ROBERTSON], from the same committee, has a perfect tariff bill in his mind, but neither one agrees with the other. There are 386 men in this House, each one of whom has a tariff bill in his own mind, but when you put a tariff bill on paper and make it legislation, that is an entirely different proposition. Everybody knows

that knows anything about legislation that it is a system of give and take, and that every tariff bill that has ever been enacted into law during our history is nothing more than a series of compromises, and so, with 386 men, with their clashing interests and conflicting claims, coming to make a tariff bill, it would be just as full of inconsistencies and incongruities and iniquities as the present system, and in making a transfer from this bill to that bill we must of necessity scatter something of terror and dismay, we must of necessity injure some institutions, we must of necessity close some factories, we must of necessity unnerve some arms, to some extent we must paralyze the confidence of capital, and the Republican party does not intend to do that now. [Loud applause on the Republican side.]

But why should we do it? Why, our Democratic friends soon after Mr. McKinley was elected President came to us with a sneer and said, "Where is this boasted prosperity of yours?" And if we had only succeeded in giving a measure of prosperity they would still be sneering at us; but by and by the sneer changed into alarm, and to-day the Democratic party is terrified at the gigantic proportions of this prosperity. Why, they say we are getting too rich, building up too much of wealth, making tremendous aggregations of capital in the United States, and gigantic combinations of wealth that far outshine the fabled wealth of Ormus and of Ind. It is so big they are scared at it. But my friends were only frightened by a shadow, and because it is big we must not be scared, because it is only a shadow.

Now, they propose to revise the tariff because they say that it is injurious and builds up these tremendous combinations of capital, and because they are strong, and are great and are wealthy. Well, if a revision of the tariff would affect those great interests, powerful and wealthy and strong, and their strength and power and wealth would be affected, what must of necessity be the effect of a change of the tariff upon the ten thousand smaller interests that are not so strong and powerful and wealthy in this nation of ours? It must of necessity crush them all, and thus blot out the only competition these great interests have to meet within the confines of our nation. Is not that true? And so there is no reason why we should revise the tariff at this time. Let it alone. We are doing well under it; we are the most marvelous nation in the history of the world to-day. We are standing upon the magnificent summit of prosperity, and the only thing on earth that throws its shadow athwart the future of this mighty nation of ours is the Democratic party. That is all. [Laughter and applause on the Republican side.]

I was much amused yesterday at the efforts of my glib-tongued friend from Missouri [Mr. CLARK] to show that Mr. Foster had made up his mind to issue bonds because of the financial condition of the United States at the time when Harrison went out and Cleveland went in. There was something of accusation and denial and crimination and recrimination in that discussion, but it seemed to me it amounted to nothing. I do not know whether the Secretary prepared to issue bonds or not. I do not know whether he prepared plates or not, nor do I care.

What I do know is this, Mr. Chairman, that after Grover Cleveland was elected President of the United States there came a change over this country. Everybody knows that. Everybody knows that the merchants quit buying, because they did not know what the price of products would be the next day. Everybody knows that the factories quit running, because the manufacturer did not know what the price of his wares would be the next day. And everybody knows that the wheels stood still. Everybody knows that these great hives of industry were deserted and that the great skyscrapers stood above them like tombstones above our ruined prosperity. Everybody knows that countless thousands of laborers tramped the highways of the nation out of money and out of food, and that they marched to Washington in Coxey armies in order to ask for relief. Everybody knows that soup houses were erected in every city and village of the land to feed the people turned out of doors by this policy.

Everybody knows that we began importing more than we exported, and that the balance of trade was against us, and that the yellow tide of gold flowed from our shores to Europe in order to make up that balance of trade. Everybody knows that the endless chain was instituted that drew the gold out of the Treasury in order to pay the current expenses of the Government, leaving us bankrupt and with a deficit on our hands. Everybody knows that whatever Mr. Foster may or may not have done, it is quite sure that Mr. Cleveland did issue bonds; that he did plunge us into debt \$262,000,000; that he did mortgage the present and pledge the future in order to try the very policy these gentlemen would now adopt. Whoever heard of an endless chain under a Republican Administration? It is the product alone of incompetent Democracy. [Applause on the Republican side.]

And, Mr. Chairman, we all know that in 1892 we stood on the summit of prosperity; and we know that a year later we were foundering in the quagmires of despair.

What caused that mighty upheaval? Why, sir, the only change that occurred was in the tariff policy of the country. We had the same farms and the same farmers; we had the same labor and the same capital; we had the same inexhaustible resources, and yet at the one time we were never so prosperous and at the other time we were never so depressed. What did it? The tariff policy of the Democratic party. [Applause on the Republican side.]

We all know too, sir, that in 1896 we were still camping on the lowlands of despair, but that in 1897 the fogs had lifted, the clouds had disappeared, and we found ourselves marching up the mountain steep toward the sunlight and toward the most marvelous era of our history. What did it?

Why, the only thing that happened between those two periods of depression and prosperity was the election of a Republican President. That is enough to know. [Applause on the Republican side.] And the people who went to school during the free-trade period of Mr. Cleveland, the people who sat on the sharp side of a rail and ate Democratic soup, know too much to get into that scrape again as long as they have sense enough to stay out of an insane asylum. [Laughter on the Republican side.]

What is the ideal condition of a country? Why, Mr. Chairman, the ideal condition of a country is, first, a sound money. The money must be safe and sane and sound. It can not be made the ship of gamblers, the tool of speculators. It must be good every day and everywhere and must be worth 100 cents in every money market of the world.

The Republican party has given you that condition. What is the second condition of a nation's prosperity? The steady employment of its laboring people at remunerative wages. Ah, has labor ever been so steadily employed as to-day? Have wages ever been so high as to-day? And my friend spoke well when he said that this tariff question was a question of labor, for it is. From skin to core and from core back to skin it is a question of labor; and this steady employment we have given the laboring people and these high wages we have given them, and it has enabled them to make the glorious civilization of to-day. Why? Why, you can not talk to me about moral progress or intellectual advancement on the part of a man whose nose is kept to the grindstone from year's end to year's end earning a pittance, every dollar of which must be spent in the shape of clothing for his back or food for his stomach.

No, there must be something more than that. There must be comfort in the home and hope in the heart. And to do this he must have an extra dollar. And it is the extra dollar we are giving the laboring people to-day that make us what we are. It is the extra dollar he is not compelled to spend that goes into the house. It is the extra dollar that has dotted the country all over with peaceful and happy homes, the very bulwark of our civilization. It is the extra dollar that puts the carpet on the floor and hangs the picture on the wall. It is the extra dollar that puts the piano in the corner of the room. It is the extra dollar that clothes the little boy. It is the extra dollar that puts the book under the arm of the little girl and sends her down to the schoolhouse built by the extra dollar, in order that she may become a useful woman. It is the extra dollar he puts into insurance to make provision for his loved ones after the strong arm has been unnerved and is forever stilled. It is the extra dollar that he puts into the great benevolent and fraternal societies that makes possible the glory of this civilization. It is the extra dollar that has called forth the marvelous bud and blossom of our great civilization, and whenever you strike down the tariff you strike down the ability of our people to earn the extra dollar, you bring them into merciless competition with people who have no extra dollars, and you strike a blow at the very vitals of our American civilization. [Applause on the Republican side.]

The Republican party has given you the second requisite to prosperity. The third is a market for our surplus. No matter how much we make, if we can not sell it stagnation results.

Mr. HUGHES of New Jersey rose.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Indiana yield to the gentleman from New Jersey?

Mr. WATSON. No; I do not want to hear from the gentleman from New Jersey.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman declines to yield.

Mr. HUGHES of New Jersey. Will the gentleman answer a question?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman declines to yield.

Mr. WATSON. We have given you the first two prerequisites to national prosperity, and the third is at hand. We propose by the very terms of this bill to open up Cuba to the products of our factories and of our farms. We propose to open up Guam and the Hawaiian Islands and the Philippine Islands, and then upon these, as stepping stones divinely placed, Uncle Sam, with giant strides, will march across the world's imperial sea and knock over yonder at the door of the Orient. When that is open to him one-third of

all the people of this world will be seen standing there with open hands and outstretched arms ready to receive the products of our factories and our farms; and not only that, but, please God, to seize the golden truths symbolized by every star upon the spangled flag of the free. [Applause on the Republican side.]

We have given to this country a market, and we propose that that market shall be extended; and thus, with sound money, and with open factories, and with abundant markets, our prosperity is assured. What if some schedules are not what they ought to be? What if there are some irregularities and incongruities? Look at the tremendous progress we have made under this bill. Let us let it alone. It is good enough for the present and it will be good enough for a few years yet to come. [Applause on the Republican side.]

But, Mr. Chairman, what is the attitude of the Democratic party upon this bill, in so far as the Democratic party can be said to have an attitude on this or on any other subject? What is it? Well, the honorable gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. ROBERTSON] is a member of the committee, and he says this about the bill:

It seems to me that this kind of reciprocity is absolutely impossible under a Democratic tariff.

This bill is impossible under a Democratic idea. Is ROBERTSON a Democrat? I do not know. Do you? I do not know what it takes to constitute a Democrat, and so I do not know whether he fills the full measure of Democracy or not.

And then the gentleman from Texas [Mr. COOPER], another member of the Ways and Means Committee, has an opinion. What does he say?

It inaugurates the policy of reciprocity, which, as now advocated by the Republican party, is as undemocratic as a tariff for protection, and which has been aptly called the "handmaiden of protection."

Is COOPER a Democrat? I do not know. Do you? And then, when the Ways and Means Committee met last year it had a man on it by the name of NEWLANDS, who is now a United States Senator from Nevada. He has received a deserved promotion—What did he say about it?

Nor should the tariff reformer be misled by the suggestion of reciprocity. Reciprocity does not mean free trade. It means the extension of the policy of protection to other countries.

Is NEWLANDS a Democrat? I do not know. Do you? Now, some of these gentlemen assume that position, but what about the other fellows? Why, the honorable leader of the minority, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS], had this to say the other day on the floor of the House:

The Democratic party does recognize that the pending bill is a Democratic measure in every principle.

Now, I put ROBERTSON and COOPER over against WILLIAMS, and you may tell me, if you can, what the Democratic party really thinks about this proposition. [Laughter on the Republican side.] Why, they say they are going to vote for it. Certainly, and so are we. And yet, with an inconsistency which is characteristically Democratic, they proposed to introduce amendments to it here which they knew would kill it. They said they did not want to kill it by introducing the amendments. They acknowledged that the amendments would kill it, and at law we all know that every man is conclusively presumed to intend all the natural consequences of his act. They knew that the amendments would kill it. They disclaimed any idea of killing the bill, and yet they wanted to introduce an amendment which would have had that effect. There is more Democratic consistency.

Ah, but the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS] said that this is a Democratic measure. Why, think of it. These Democrats absolutely pledge themselves in this bill against voting for any reduction on one solitary pound of sugar from any country in all the world for the next five years, and yet they claim that is a free-trade proposition. They absolutely pledge themselves not to vote for any reduction on any sugar from any country for five years, and yet they say that is an approach to free trade. Well, if that is an approach to free trade the Republicans can stand four square with them on the proposition and be well pleased with the result.

Why, Mr. Chairman, what is the attitude of the Democracy on this question? Does anybody know? What difference does it make what their attitude is? Whatever their attitude is to-day they may change it to-morrow, for if there is anything absolutely sure in this world it is that the Democratic party has started out in the present campaign, not with principle in view, but with the idea of winning. That is all they want to do, and all they ask is, "Give us somebody to win with. No matter what principles he professes, it does not matter what platform he stands upon, with whom can we win?"

PROSPERITY DUE TO REPUBLICAN PRINCIPLES.

Why, my friend from Iowa spoke of the marvelous progress of this country for the last forty years. I would like to go a little more into detail on this proposition. My Democratic friends,

what have you done in order to warrant the people of this country in giving you control of the Government? What great act of this country that has added glory to the flag or prosperity to our people has ever sprung from the sterile brain of Democracy? What one in the last forty years? Can you name it? Why, the Republican party took charge of this country in 1860. We have had charge of it continuously ever since except four years from 1893 to 1897. Absolutely every act that has made this country great and grand has sprung from the luminous genius of Republican statesmanship. The only act that was passed under Mr. Cleveland was the tariff act that scattered terror and dismay everywhere and left us dismantled and broken. Is not that true? Why, my friends, that was the only national act that was passed under Mr. Cleveland. Did that conduce to national prosperity? Did it not rather retard our development many years? All the acts that ever conducted to this tremendous prosperity have come alone from the Republican party, and shall I go further into details about it? Why, as my friend has already said, our wealth then was \$16,000,000,000. Now it is \$95,000,000,000.

Our Democratic friends used to say to us that we did not give them enough money with which to do the business of this country. What is the truth in regard to that? In 1860 the gold in circulation was \$228,000,000; now it is \$630,000,000. Then the silver in circulation was none, and now it is \$164,000,000. Then there was not a single gold certificate; to-day there are \$379,000,000. Then there were no silver certificates; now there are \$455,000,000. Then the total circulation was \$435,000,000; to-day the circulation is \$2,376,000,000, and every dollar worth a hundred cents in every money market in the world. Then the per capita circulation was \$13.85; now it is \$29.57. Then we had no national banks in the country; now we have 4,939. Then, of course, we had no national-bank capital; now we have \$743,000,000 of that capital. Then loans and discounts were none; now \$3,415,000,000. Then the bank clearings were \$7,231,000,000; now they are \$76,000,000,000. Then the deposits of national banks were none; now \$3,200,000,000. Then the deposits in savings banks were \$149,277,000; now they are \$2,750,000,000. Then the total deposits were none; now \$9,258,000,000; placing us easily the first among all the nations of this world as to our present financial condition and our industrial prosperity.

Then the total receipts for all purposes were \$109,000,000, now \$1,097,000,000. Then the total imports were \$353,000,000; now they are \$1,025,000,000, an increase of imports of \$736,000,000. The total exports then were \$334,000,000 and last year were \$1,420,000,000, or an increase of \$1,087,000,000. The excess of imports over exports then were \$20,000,000. The excess now of exports over imports is \$395,000,000. That is the difference from the time we took charge of this country. There were twenty millions more imports than exports, and last year we sent out \$396,000,000 more than we received, and the yellow tide of gold is rolling into this country to pay the balance of trade in our favor. These are the results of Republican legislation. [Loud applause on the Republican side.]

How about manufacturing? Then the number of establishments were 140,400, now 512,300. Then the number of hands employed was 1,311,000, now 5,719,000. Then the wages and salaries paid amounted to \$378,800,000; now they amount to \$2,735,400,000. Then the products were \$1,880,000,000; now they are \$13,200,000,000, which is greater than the combined output of any other three nations in the world, and places us proudly first among the manufacturing nations of the world. While they were paid wages and salaries of \$378,000,000 then, and now \$2,735,000,000, I call attention to this further fact, that then the per capita wages paid to the men was \$288, while now it is \$474, one-half greater than the average for all of Europe. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Is not this a record of which we can be proud? Is it not a record of which we may justly boast? And over against that the Democratic party sets itself up and wants to destroy the very agency which has made possible this marvelous prosperity that is to-day the wonder and admiration of the world.

INCOMPETENT DEMOCRACY.

Well, what will our Democratic friends do about it? Mr. Chairman, their prophets say that they propose to take charge of this nation next time. Suppose you do it. My Democratic friends after the control of the Government remind me of a dog running after a train. It does a great deal of barking and fussing, and when it gets to it it does not know what to do with it. [Laughter.] So with these gentlemen, if they had charge of this Government to-day what would they do with it? What policy would they enforce? Would they be in favor of free trade or would they be in favor of reciprocity or a tariff for revenue only? What would the Democratic party do? Does anybody know? Has that party to-day any principles? Can anybody tell? Why, even in the House there seems to be a clash of authority and dual leadership,

for after Mr. WILLIAMS, the gentleman from Mississippi, the leader, has his say, it becomes necessary for the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. DE ARMOND] to express his opinion on the same proposition. Have you noticed that?

We hope on this side that brethren over there will dwell together in amity and unity. I had hoped that when the gentleman from Missouri returned this time, after an absence during the summer communing with Nature, that he would have come back with the singing of birds and the laughter of brooks in his voice, and in his speech there might have been reflected something of the overarching sky and the shimmering stars, but it is the same gentleman from Missouri as of yore, prophesying the destruction of the Republic and the overthrow of the Government. [Laughter.] But ah, somehow or other, the thing manages to get along; somehow the old ship keeps driving to the front; somehow or other the Republican party keeps its hand on the helm, and somehow or other we are going to land in port after a while where even the Democratic party can not disturb us. [Laughter and applause on the Republican side.]

But if they have no measures, how about men? The other day I was amused by reading in the Washington Post some interviews with distinguished Democrats. Listen to them. They are full of instruction as to Democratic purposes:

Mr. GARRER, of Ohio. I am very much impressed with the article published in the Post this morning, dated Montgomery, Ala., wherein Mr. Hood, editor of the Montgomery Journal, has put his views forth in a remarkably clear and sensible way. The Ohio Democrat, be he radical or conservative (if there be two kinds), would not support Mr. Cleveland, either for the nomination or at the election. They want a man who has regularity as the primary requisite. I have heard many kindly expressions with reference to Senator GORMAN, while Judge Parker has many friends. Mr. HEARST also occupies a warm place in the hearts of Ohio Democrats.

Who is this man Cleveland? He is the only man they have been able to elect President of the United States since James Buchanan. For three successive campaigns they followed him, they apotheosized him, they deified him, they put him on the chief pedestal in the joss house, and they swung censurers in his presence and sung daily, "O Grover, holy, holy, holy art thou." [Great laughter and applause on the Republican side.] And yet here rises a Democrat to say that they would not support him, either at the convention or at the election.

Mr. BAKER, of New York. It can not be said that sentiment in Brooklyn has crystallized in favor of any particular candidate. It is hoped to secure a candidate who will be imbued with the doctrines of true Democracy—

What a citizen he would be, wouldn't he? to be imbued with all the doctrines of Democracy! [Laughter on the Republican side.] He would be a Pandora's box, wouldn't he? if opened up to public view [laughter on the Republican side]—

and one who, if elected, will not betray his party. It would be impossible at this time to say who the Democrats of my district favor for the nomination. The man who meets their approval, however, must be a man of strong and decided convictions. No colorless candidate will be satisfactory.

Now, I wonder whom he means. Why, is it not a fact that the Democrats have been wandering up and down the country looking for somebody to run for President who has no views on any proposition in the world? [Laughter.] And is it not a fact that they are attempting to nominate Judge Parker, of New York, solely because nobody knows what he thinks on any question; nobody knows what he thinks on the tariff question, or what he thinks on the expansion question, or any other question before the American people to-day? [Laughter on the Republican side.] Is not that true? Is not that true? They take it for granted, and they are right, that if a Democrat has a record at all, it is a bad record. [Laughter on the Republican side.]

But listen to Mr. UNDERWOOD of Alabama.

It is a safe prediction that the Alabama delegation in the next national convention will be uninstructed as to Presidential choice. The sentiment is in favor of some strong eastern man who would be acceptable to the West. [Laughter on the Republican side.]

There never was anything like the Democratic party.

When such a man is found—

Swing your telescope around the horizon and sweep the earth and find your man!

When such a man is found the South will give him hearty support—

They are looking for the fellow, regardless of what he believes or what the platform is to be; that makes no difference. [Laughter on the Republican side.]

When such a man is found, the South will give him hearty support, and he will be elected. [Laughter on the Republican side.] The South is particularly anxious to win—[laughter on the Republican side]—to defeat Theodore Roosevelt. Personally, I favor Mr. Olney, of Massachusetts; but I am for the man whom it is demonstrated is most acceptable to both the East and the West.

Then comes my friend SIMS, from Tennessee, with the frankest statement of Democratic desires, aspirations, and hopes of any man; and what does Mr. SIMS say?

The majority of Tennessee Democrats appear to favor the nomination of Judge Parker, of New York, but the sentiment is not a decided one.

It is only an appearance.

They believe Judge Parker would make a strong candidate, but if some other man is stronger they want that man nominated. Tennessee Democrats want to win. [Laughter on the Republican side.]

There, gentlemen, is the Democratic platform. That is the sum and substance of it all. It does not make any difference what a man believes. It does not make any difference what the platform is upon which he stands, if he can win. And is there a man here who doubts that if these Democrats thought that they could rehabilitate and regitalize William Jennings Bryan and win with him on a platform of 16 to 1 that they would adopt that platform and nominate the man and go into the campaign with him? Is not that so? Why, of course it is. That is the history of this party for the last forty years.

Ah, how differently situated are we! Every time I go into a Republican convention I am inspired by the pictured representations of the great men who have been our leaders in the days gone by—Lincoln, the emancipator, always present in every Republican convention; Grant, the silent, unconquered hero, and Garfield, and Blaine, and McKinley, the gentlest memory of our day. Those are the men who have made this country, and in making it they have been compelled to walk over the prostrate form of the Democratic party year in and year out. Those are the men whose pictures we hang up and who inspire the youth of this country with patriotism and with hope.

Now, when the Democrats have a convention, whose picture will they hang up? [Laughter on the Republican side.] Will they hang up the picture of Grover Cleveland? Why, these gentlemen here say they would not vote for him at a convention or at an election—this very man, the only one they have been able to elect President of the United States. What a marvelous metamorphosis in the Democratic mind. Would they hang up the picture of William Jennings Bryan, the "peerless leader?" [Laughter on the Republican side.] Twice they followed him in memorable campaigns; one the most marvelous in the history of modern times. Why don't they follow him now? If 16 to 1 was right then, isn't it right now? If Bryan was the deified appearance on earth of the angelic principle then, isn't he so yet? How has he changed? How has the country changed? How has the situation changed? Ah, in only this, that they found they could not win with Bryan. Will they hang up his picture? No. Whose picture will they hang up? Well, they will have to fall clear back on Jackson and Jefferson. Whenever the Democratic party runs out of anybody modern they fall back on Jackson and Jefferson. But it will be remembered, my friends, that Jefferson was a gold bug of the most pronounced type. It will be remembered that Andrew Jackson came to be a protectionist of the most pronounced type, and it will be remembered that the views of these great men on these fundamental questions now before the country corresponded no more with the whimsies of modern Democracy than do the stately and transcendent stanzas of David's psalms or the majestic sweep of Shakespeare's loftiest strains correspond with the wheezy rag-time rendition by a back-alley aggregation of "Johnnie, get your gun." [Laughter on the Republican side.]

And so we are all right for the coming campaign. Why, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GROSVENOR] has got it figured out already. Of course we will go on through with the formality of an election, but when all is said and done, the people will be satisfied with what the Republican party has done in this great country of ours. That is our platform—What we have done.

As Conkling said about Grant, the Republican party is great in the arduous greatness of things done. And so, my friends, with these leaders, with these principles, with this platform, in solid array and unbroken phalanx, we shall move on in the future as we have in the past, leading our people on up to greater and nobler heights; and when that shall have been done, when the future triumph shall have been achieved, it will be because the Republican party has always been true to the sublime idea of protection to American industries—to American capital and to American labor. I thank you. [Prolonged applause on the Republican side.]

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. DE ARMOND] is recognized for ten minutes. [Prolonged applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. DE ARMOND. Mr. Chairman, but one thing is lacking to complete this scene. If the average, representative grammar-school boy of Indiana were here in the gallery he would congratulate himself with pride and pleasure upon the fact that a good deal of the matter of his schoolboy orations, and almost all of the manner of them, had been copied and reproduced by the eloquent gentleman from Indiana [Mr. WATSON] who has just taken his seat. [Laughter.]

Mr. Chairman, several gentlemen upon the other side, including the distinguished gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HEPBURN], have given from their point of view many convincing reasons why they should vote against this bill, and then with the usual incon-

sistency which characterizes many of them, especially upon this question, they have declared meekly and amiably that they intend to vote for it. Their logic is bad or their action is inexcusable—perhaps it is a question as to which is worst.

The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GROSVENOR], asked to unfold the righteousness of the proceeding when the steel trust sells steel rails to Germany for \$29 a ton and "holds up" the American for \$28 for the same quantity and quality of the same article, told about how the merchant in October and November sells for 50 cents each articles the duplicates of which brought \$1 in May and June.

From this happy illustration of the point of the argument for refusing to revise the tariff, so long as the steel trust and the other like trusts, from their own blissful experience, shall continue to pronounce it good, we might conclude that there are summer and winter weights and fashions in steel rails, as in bonnets, and that when the steel trust sells steel rails in Germany at \$29 and in the United States at \$28, the rails sold abroad at the reduced price are remnants, shop-worn, and sold out of season, as summer rails in winter, or winter rails in summer, while the American buys smooth, fresh, bright, unwrinkled rails, strictly in season and very fashionable. But even credulity fails to further the delusion when this gentleman, so apt in explaining the inexplicable, fails, neglects, and refuses, though duly invited to the performance, to say just why there should not be any revision of a schedule which shelters a trust and enables it to exact \$28 for a ton of steel rails which it makes at a cost of \$12.

The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HEPBURN] told us that away back a hundred years ago, or fifty years ago, or twenty-five years ago, the American people did not produce so much, did not export so much, had not accumulated so much as now; therefore do not think of revising the tariff which we have now, but did not have in the unhappy past! This argument is a simple one, and I crave the gentleman's pardon while I remark that it is not altogether new. But I cast no reproaches upon the argument because it is ancient; on the contrary, I would respect its gray hairs, wherein all its respectability nestles. It is the argument of coincidences, and if one can but be content with it one may establish anything by it.

During the life of the Dingley tariff law we freed Cuba and loaded up with the Philippines; therefore the Dingley tariff law did it. In all the years of our national life, before the trusts gave us the Dingley tariff law, we neither freed Cuba nor loaded up with the Philippines; therefore we could neither push Spain off of Cuba nor pull the Philippines over onto ourselves without the Dingley tariff law.

Of course evil-minded persons might employ this handy argument of coincidences for evil purposes. For instance, they might say there are more consumptives in the land now than there were in the earlier periods of our national life, and that therefore the Dingley law produced tuberculosis. They might assert that there are more children in the United States to-day than there were when the Walker tariff was in operation, and that therefore the Dingley tariff has been our salvation from the peril of race suicide. This list of helpful illustrations could be extended almost without limit.

It is also true that a devoted student of our country's history might construct from the materials at hand a curious theory to the effect that we Americans are much more numerous now than we were some decades earlier in the sweep of time, and that well-tilled fields produce more grain, and horses, and cattle, and hogs than dense areas of unbroken forest, and that more manufacturing is done in a great city than in a cabin in the wilderness.

Some might even indulge the extravagant speculation that, under any tariff system or with none, the pioneer in a cabin, in a little clearing in a great forest, ought hardly to be censured very severely if he did not have as many children or dollars as all his descendants and the neighbors could show a generation or two or three generations later, when time and the genius of human development had worked their miracles.

It might be generous, and I submit to the gentleman from Iowa, who has spoken on one side to explain why he will vote on the other side, that it might also be correct to credit the growth of the nation to the vast and varied resources of the goodly land in which we dwell, and to the courage, industry, perseverance, invention, and general nobility of our people. He and all of us may do well to look beyond coincidences for the causes and effects upon which to build theories, and from which to get policies.

The matter which we really have to consider, passing from this bill and going to the general tariff question, is not that of free trade or protection, but whether or not the present tariff law shall be revised. That is the real question, with reference to the tariff, now before the country. The gentlemen upon the other side take the position that it ought not to be and shall not be revised, except in some distant day of the future, in some far-off year. We hold that it ought to be, and declare that if the American people intrust us with the power it shall be revised.

There is an issue which it is easy to put and easy to understand, and which we mean the gentlemen upon the other side shall be compelled to meet. We recognize conditions as conditions are, and they must do it also.

We are not bent upon any crusade to destroy any element of real prosperity in this country, but we are determined, if we get the power, to strike down, as far as we can, the nefarious creatures which have sprung up in this country, designated and known by the general name of "trusts," that prey upon and rob the American people. In so far as the tariff builds up and shelters these evil institutions we shall make upon it relentless war. In so far as it may have the effect of developing and advancing the industries of this country, by equalizing taxation and opportunity, we shall stand by it, not make an assault upon it. What shall be done with this schedule; what shall be done with that? What shall be done with regard to the tariff upon this item or that item? These are plain, practical questions. Gentlemen shall not divert us from them to abstract discussions of free trade or protection.

The country has settled upon the policy of raising a considerable part of its revenues by tariff taxation. Whenever a tariff is imposed upon any article whatsoever, the like article, if produced in this country, is a "protected" article to the extent of that tariff, whatever the object of the laying of that duty and whatever its effects in other respects. As we shall have for years and years to come, and perhaps during the entire life of the nation, a tariff covering thousands of articles, bringing millions of dollars in revenue into the Treasury of the United States, the question will be and the question must be from time to time—always a shifting question, liable to change, and changed from time to time by developments and incidents and accidents and events in our own land and the world over—What ought the duty to be now? Is the duty right or is it wrong now?

To that question, laying aside all quibbles and all speculations, laying aside all this grandiloquence about what the Republican party is said to have done, about what the Republican party has professed; laying aside all these arguments of coincidence, what answer are you going to make? Is this Dingley tariff to stand as it is, with all the inequalities, hardships, and injustice in it, with huge trusts sheltered by it, or is the tariff to be corrected? Is it to be amended? Is it to be changed where it needs change, where the wisdom and justice and desirability of change are so plain that no man can deny the virtue of the claim that change ought to take place? That is the question upon the tariff, and upon that question we will meet you and fight it out.

Now, either this bill is right enough for passage or wrong enough to merit defeat. Some gentlemen say it ought to be defeated. If those gentlemen sincerely wish to defeat it, why did they not help to vote down the rule and have it amended? Let them answer to their constituents. The man who believes this bill ought to be defeated and who voted against the rule, voted for an opportunity to amend it, and who votes against the bill in its present form, is consistent. The man who claims that the bill ought to be defeated, but who voted to take away all the opportunity that existed, directly or indirectly, to defeat it or to change it, stultifies himself.

If he is honest to his constituency, he has demonstrated his wisdom, as well as his honesty, by efforts to amend the bill. If he is dishonest, he has added to dishonesty folly, because the pretext of expediency is so transparent that he who runs may read through it.

But gentlemen say we on this side would risk the defeat of this bill. Of course we would risk it. When the question comes between legislating for the people and "protection" to the sugar trust by increasing the mighty, overshadowing power of the grasping, grinding trust, then, on this bill or any other bill, we are against the trusts and against the policy which the trusts dictate. We are in favor of striking off the differential, sugar-trust duty. We are in favor of the amendment of this bill, and then [if this bill be not passed for that reason—because of the amendment—as for that reason the other Cuban reciprocity bill was not passed, then we shall have another demonstration, a second demonstration, for the American people that the party in the majority in this House and in the Senate, dominated and influenced too largely by interests that are adverse to the welfare of the American people, will not do that which is fair and just, because the mighty agencies to which they bow in humble submission decree that they shall go the other way.

Let the man who regards party organization rather than fidelity to constituency appeal in the hour of his peril, appeal in the dark day of his disaster, to the party organization. Let him raise his voice and call upon the party to save him rather than call upon his constituents, against whom he has turned and whose rights here he has given away, sold out—I do not say "sold out" in the corrupt sense, because I charge nothing of that kind—bartered for the hope of a good place upon a committee, for the smiles of the gentleman who presides as Speaker in the chair which you now, Mr. Chairman, temporarily occupy.

For the favor of those who rule here in the House he has forgotten the men far away on the prairie or among the pine stumps, the men out where the sugar beets grow, the men to whom he whispered his words of affection, into whose ears he poured the sweet songs of his love while seeking their votes. He has forgotten them, has harkened to the voice of the tempter, and has fallen away from them; but the day of reckoning is coming for him, and when it arrives, then, through every agency by which opposition may be heard, the call will be made upon these people to say what they think of him and his doings. [Loud applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. I yield three minutes to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. THOMPSON].

Mr. THOMPSON. Mr. Chairman, an old negro preacher down in Alabama began his sermon by saying: "I thank de Lord that those who are not for us are not agin us." The Republicans of this special session of Congress, like the old negro preacher, can exclaim that those who are not for us are not "agin" us, but they are not receiving the support they are getting from this side of the House with apparent good grace.

I construe this bill providing for reciprocity with Cuba as a Democratic measure, because it carries out, to some degree at least, Democratic principles, and for that reason, as well as for the further reason that it strikes me as a practical business proposition favorable to the business interests of the United States, which when enacted will give us, if not now, in the near future, cheaper sugar for the consumer and enlarge and increase our export trade with Cuba on terms more profitable to our people.

I can, therefore, with impunity lay aside my prejudice against it by virtue of its origin from the Republican side, and look at it strictly from a business and not a political point of view, and give it my unqualified support. I could vote for it with fuller and freer grace if the majority of this House would permit us to further amend the bill by taking off the differential on sugar, thereby giving the consumer in the American Republic a real and not a speculative benefit.

The subject of this debate, the subject of the pending bill, the subject of this very session itself, is reciprocity. It is well, therefore, at the outset to understand fully what reciprocity means.

Reciprocity is a word derived from the Latin prepositions "re" and "pro," which, being molded into the adjectives "recus" and "procus," signify "backward" and "forward." The combined Latin adjective "reciprocus" thus comes to mean "moving backward and forward," or "alternating," or "mutually exchanging." Hence, our English adjective "reciprocal" and our English noun "reciprocity," meaning a mutual exchange or interchange. In connection with a treaty or agreement between two nations, "reciprocity" is defined as "equality of commercial privileges between the subjects of the different governments in each other's ports with respect to shipping or merchandise to the extent established by the treaty."

In this case the proposed reciprocity, or "equality of commercial privileges," is between the citizens, respectively, of the United States and the citizens of Cuba.

We are called here in extraordinary session to consider the reciprocity treaty or convention with Cuba, which the President of the United States thinks is expedient and necessary to be ratified.

I differ somewhat with the President on this, as well as other subjects not now under discussion, and I think it was entirely unnecessary to convene Congress in extra session for the consideration of this treaty. I believe this work could have been done fully as well and that it would have subserved all essential purposes and saved the Government thousands of dollars if it had been permitted to go over to the regular session in December.

But the gentleman who presides in the White House seems to be an "extraordinary" being and to enjoy doing things in "extraordinary" ways. He has demonstrated to the country that he constitutes the Republican party by an overwhelming majority.

In the Fifty-seventh Congress, when this very same subject was under consideration, Members coming here from the beet-sugar districts, derisively called "blanket Indians" by their brethren on the other side of the Chamber, showed the courage of their convictions by rebelling against the power of the Administration. Now they are as humble as "dumb, driven cattle." They complacently kiss the Executive hand which has smitten them, and patiently cry, "Enough!"

The President has demonstrated his strenuousness and potentiality. In the counsels of his party he is "lord of all he surveys." Aggressive, arbitrary, and autocratic, he has literally compelled not only the leaders but the rank and file of the dear old "God and morality party" to depart from the "straight and narrow path" of a high protective tariff policy and to take one first step toward the accomplishment of a Democratic triumph—toward the permanent establishment of the Democratic policy of a tariff just sufficient to raise a revenue necessary to defray all

the legitimate expenses of honest government economically administered.

The Republican chief priests, whose features we have all learned to recognize in this House, who so delight to minister at the shining altars of protectionism and to burn incense in the presence of their heathen god, the golden calf, prostrate themselves in the dust at the feet of his "majesty," and now rend their garments, claw their faces, tear the hair from their own anointed heads, and declare with loud acclaim that the sea wall against the admission of Cuban sugar must totter and fall to the earth.

When another decree goes forth from the White House to remove the duty on some other favored and fostered industry, notwithstanding your slogans of "stand pat" and "let well enough alone," you Republicans will again obey his imperialistic command and willingly vote at his beck and call a reduction of the tariff on some other article of everyday necessity.

The Republican baby, just now crawling toward the light, will yet grow up into vigorous Democratic manhood. The infant will yet learn to walk in the pure fresh air of genuine Democratic tariff reform to be occasioned by reciprocity with other nations. You will learn by degrees, "line upon line, and precept upon precept." You will overturn your heretical theories and accept correct Democratic principles and doctrines promulgated for the government and guidance of all classes and conditions of men, "the common masses of the 'common' people." Laws which enable the few to grow fat and sleek with insolence and pride at the expense of the many will be swept away. The lamb and the lion will lie down together, and the devil will be chained for a thousand years.

You, my friends, on the western side of the center aisle, have been for many dismal years sitting in the region of darkness. At last you are beginning to behold the morning light of truth breaking in through the shadows of doubt—"black Vesper's pageants." In the solitude a bird of heavenly plumage even now is singing to you the song of repentance and radiant hope. In the desert a sparkling fountain of joy is gushing out from the jagged rocks of distrust. In the wide waste of your despair a green bay tree of splendid promise is already extending to you its long arms of affectionate welcome and protecting care. "In the wilderness" you are listening to the clear, ringing voice of Democracy, like the prophet of old crying, "Prepare ye the way of the Lord, make His path straight." The immortal Shakespeare, in Henry VI, accurately describes your present predicament when he puts it in the mouth of one of his characters to say:

In that hope, I throw mine eyes to Heaven,
Scorning whate'er you can afflict me with.

My Republican friends, I congratulate you upon the movement you have inaugurated, upon the first forward-march step you taken. After a little while nothing of your boasted party principles will remain.

You will then, no doubt, be in such mellow mood as to be able to appreciate the words of the poet:

One by one the roses fall,
Drop by drop the spring runs dry;
One by one, beyond recall,
Summer flowers droop and die.

Now, in considering the question of reciprocity with Cuba, the first thought that occurs to me is this: That if it be the purpose of the Administration to benefit the consumers of sugar in the United States we should go still further with our propositions to the young Republic of Cuba, which enjoys her freedom and independence at our hands at an expenditure of \$250,000,000, and we should say to her: "You may send all of your raw sugar material to us free of duty." Then the American consumer might realize some benefit therefrom worth speaking about and the sugar refineries of the United States would get the benefit of refining the entire product of sugar in Cuba, thereby giving additional employment to American labor.

While our country has been enjoying great prosperity for some years in nearly every section, so far as the producers, manufacturers, and dealers are concerned, there has been but little real gain or benefit therefrom for the laboring man in the United States. His rents have increased, his grocery bills have become higher, and all that he eats or wears or consumes in any way comes dearer to him to-day than it ever has done before since the abnormal times of the civil war. It seems to me, then, that in making treaties and framing legislation to control the importation from other nations of commodities to be consumed by our people our first duty is to protect our own laboring people by seeing to it that they shall have at least the necessities of life at the least possible cost.

While I realize the fact that it takes money to run our Government, and that our principal source of revenue is the tariff, I am a strong advocate of reducing the duties on all raw material that comes to our shores, and thereby encouraging and aiding our manufacturers and enabling them to employ more labor. As our

population increases it will become more and more necessary to foster and encourage manufacturing among our people. Senator MORGAN said in a speech in Montgomery, Ala., recently delivered before the legislature of that State, that he believed the solution of the labor question would be by means of the use of electricity. He said:

The congested condition of our people in and around our large manufacturing enterprises, whose education is being neglected and physical development dwarfed by working their children in factories, could be remedied by placing electricity where it could be rented by small manufacturers, and thereby making them the owners and operators of their own manufacturing plants.

Let us now examine the pending treaty or convention and see what it is that we are asked to ratify.

Article I of the treaty stipulates that all the products of either the United States or Cuba that are now on the free lists of the two countries shall continue to be on the free lists.

Article II provides that all other products of Cuba shall be admitted into this country at a reduction of 20 per cent of the regular tariff rates of the United States.

Article III provides that all the products of the United States not included in Article I and not enumerated in Article IV shall be admitted into Cuba at a reduction of 20 per cent of the regular tariff rates of Cuba.

Article IV specifies certain products of the United States which are to be admitted into Cuba at still greater reductions of the regular rates—iron and steel manufactures, copper manufactures, glassware, earthenware, etc., at 25 per cent reduction; most cotton manufactures, linen goods, paper, cutlery, boots and shoes, soap, various articles of food, etc., at 30 per cent reduction, and woolen goods, silk goods, knit goods, perfumery, watches, and some other articles at 40 per cent reduction.

In a subsequent article it is stipulated that all these reciprocal rates shall be preferential in respect to like imports from other countries; and then follows the singular proviso attached to the treaty by the Senate last March, after the document had left the hands of the plenipotentiaries who drew it up, which proviso stipulates that during the life of the treaty there shall be no further reduction of the duty on Cuban sugar and no reduction whatever of the duty on sugar coming from any other country besides Cuba. This proviso, thrown into the treaty at the last moment, obviously in the interest of the sugar trust, I believe to be certainly unconstitutional. I do not believe that it can stand against the scrutiny of the courts for an instant.

If the majority in this House had not stifled all amendment and ruled out all alteration of the pending bill, and if the House were at liberty to modify the measure, as it ought to be and would be except for the arbitrary action of the controlling power here, I have no doubt that this obnoxious proviso would be expunged by vote of a large majority of Members here present of both parties, for the principle embodied in the proviso is as injurious to one party as to the other and a fatal stab at the vital right of representative government. Did I not firmly believe that this grave assault on our liberties will be nullified by the courts, nothing could induce me to give it even an indirect sanction.

The bill would be greatly improved by the addition of the amendment proposed by the minority for taking off the differential duty on refined sugar. Such an amendment, it will be remembered, was proposed and adopted in the reciprocity legislation of 1902. If adopted now, it would beyond question have assured a genuine benefit to the consumers of sugar in the United States, and if a vote could be had upon this proposition now there is no reason for doubting that the result would be the same as that of last year's vote; but under the drastic rule adopted by the Republican side of the House, prohibiting the consideration of amendments of any kind, the House is obliged to take the treaty as it stands or nothing.

Excepting the obnoxious proviso just alluded to—an essentially extraneous matter, and one not germane to the subject in hand—the treaty commends itself to myself as a Democrat, and I believe it commends itself to most of those on this side of the House as Democrats, because, although it is offered as an Administration measure, under Republican auspices, it is in line with Democratic principles, at least approximately, and seems to go in the right direction, though not far in that direction. We support the bill, therefore, on the principle that a half loaf is better than no bread, and that it is a measure acceptable to Democratic faith and practice, though only in a small degree.

Reciprocity as a general principle commends itself to the Democracy as a rule, because it is calculated to benefit the consumers of the products imported into our country and to reduce the tariffs of other countries on the products of the United States.

In the present instance reciprocity with Cuba would be calculated and intended to benefit the American consumers of the products imported hither from Cuba by diminishing the duties upon them by 20 per cent and to benefit our own producers and manufacturers by enabling us to enter our products into Cuba at

reductions of 20, 25, 30, and 40 per cent of the regular Cuban duties on those products coming into Cuba from the world at large.

So far as I am concerned, I would gladly go further than is now proposed in our concessions to Cuba. I would gladly give our Cuban ward absolute free trade in every respect and in all our different lines of products. Thus we would vastly benefit both ourselves and the Cubans by selling them all they buy and by buying from them all they sell on mutually advantageous terms. There is no doubt in my mind that the United States holds a position of peculiar and uncommon responsibility toward Cuba, mainly on account of the obligations expressed or implied in the Platt amendment in limiting Cuba's treaty-making powers, etc. That we should therefore show our good will and sympathy for Cuba by giving her at least reciprocity is greatly to be wished. The chief objection to its proposed application in the present case, as it seems to me, is that reciprocity with one single country alone or with two or three or four countries alone is a partial and one-sided reciprocity and may expose us to retaliation and reprisals by other less-favored nations. But even granting this objection, it appears to me indisputable that the proposed reciprocity with Cuba is in the line of tariff reform, and therefore commendable, so far as it goes.

Bishop Warren A. Candler, of Georgia, one of the leading bishops in the Methodist Church and one of the ablest men of this age, said recently on this subject that:

By the Platt amendment we claim the right to supervise Cuba's relations with other governments. Will we forbid her trading with others advantageously, and then force her to trade with us at prices forced upon her by our power? This is to force her "to trade at the company's store" in a way that would disgrace a rapacious corporation which should undertake to grind the life out of its operatives. Or, to state the case in other words, it is for this great Government to play the dog in the manger act. Surely so great a power will not hold up and rob its own ward. To do so would dishonor us before the world.

Moreover, our duty and our interests coincide in this instance. We do not make sugar enough to meet our wants, and we need what Cuba has. She needs our cotton goods and agricultural implements and other of our products. But she can not buy from us to advantage unless she can sell to us profitably; ships have to have a load both ways. We lose much Cuban trade as the case stands, and what we sell to her is a sort of forced trade, which is next door to robbery.

The inspiration back of the disposition to go wrong in this matter is the superstition of a protective tariff, and the Democrats have not had in years such a chance to blow up the defenses of that abominable system as this case of Cuba supplies. The protective tariff has been for years a kind of arctic wave with high pressure in the North bearing down with blasting effect upon all South of the thrifty saints who profit by it. It was at its best in the civil war and became accustomed to live by the blood of the slain, and now it would make of none effect the blood of men who fell in Cuba, and all that it may fill its pockets at public expense. It has not a shred of principle nor a shadow of expediency to justify its attitude as to Cuba. It simply stands on its miserable self-interest in seeking to have this Government dishonor its pledges and adopt a policy of folly.

Let us look into the subject practically and in detail, and see how the pending treaty or convention would work in everyday business intercourse and industry.

The principal products of Cuba are sugar and its by-products, molasses and spirits; tobacco, both unmanufactured and manufactured; iron ore, manganese ore, asphalt, and other mineral substances; lumber, vegetable fibers, and other forest products; fruits, vegetables, live stock, hides, and other animal products; coffee, sponges, wax, and honey. Most of these products are in constant demand and nearly universal use in the United States. So far as sugar, molasses, tobacco, pineapples, bananas, cacao, coconuts, iron ore, mahogany, and other tropical woods are concerned, the market for those Cuban products in this country may be said to be very large indeed. According to the official figures contained in the valuable monograph, "Commercial Cuba in 1903," recently published by the Bureau of Statistics of the Department of Commerce and Labor, the United States took from Cuba during the fiscal year 1903 1,069,610 tons of sugar, valued at \$42,697,546. This was nearly 100,000 tons more than Cuba's total sugar crop of 1903. In other words, we have taken the whole of this year's crop and a large amount of the reserve stock besides. Our imports of Cuban tobacco during the same fiscal year amounted in value to \$13,141,646; of Cuban pineapples, to about \$1,000,000; of Cuban bananas, about the same; of Cuban iron ore, to about a million and a half, and of mahogany and other valuable woods to nearly a million. On most of these and most of the other articles of Cuban production the United States levies import duties.

Our total imports from Cuba amounted in the last fiscal year to nearly \$63,000,000 in value. Of these, probably at least \$60,000,000 were dutiable, the sugar duties ranging upward from what would amount to 50 per cent ad valorem to perhaps 100 per cent ad valorem, the tobacco duties amounting to all the way from 100 to 300 per cent ad valorem, and the other duties certainly reaching an average of 25 per cent ad valorem. It is easy to see, therefore, when such a large proportion of these \$60,000,000 of dutiable imports consists of sugar and tobacco, on which the duties are so heavy, that a reduction of 20 per cent in the tariff on imports from Cuba would result in a great saving to the consumers of those articles in the United States, as such articles imported from Cuba

under the new arrangement could be sold here at a corresponding reduction. It is contended in some quarters that no such reduction would result in the price of sugar, because the price of sugar is said to be fixed at Hamburg, Germany, and to be independent of the supply of cane sugar. Then it seems to me that the price in this country must be kept up by artificial means, and largely, no doubt, owing to the differential duty on refined sugar, which our Republican brethren insist upon for the benefit of the sugar trust, because even if Germany is the greatest sugar-producing country, we get very little sugar from Germany or from any other beet-sugar producing country.

The bulk of the sugar which we import comes from Cuba and from Java and other cane-sugar localities. In the last fiscal year we imported about 2,000,000 tons, valued at about \$72,000,000. Of this more than half came from Cuba alone—something over 1,000,000 tons, valued at nearly \$43,000,000, as I have just now shown—while about 350,000 tons came from Java, valued at \$13,000,000; less than 200,000 tons from South America, valued at a little over \$6,000,000; and from Germany only 31,120 tons, valued at about \$1,000,000. We consume annually about 2,500,000 tons, or just about one-quarter of the sugar produced in the whole world. If Cuba furnishes us with 1,000,000 tons, or two-fifths of what we consume, and if one-fifth, or 500,000 tons, is produced by ourselves in this country, including Hawaii, and more than one-fifth in Java, the British West Indies, and other cane-sugar countries, it seems peculiar, to say the least, that the European beet-sugar countries should have so much to say about what the price of sugar must be in the United States.

The high sugar-tariff advocates told us last year that Cuban sugar could not dictate prices here now, but that if Cuba should ever be able to supply to us our whole foreign import of sugar—2,000,000 tons—that is to say, just about twice what she furnishes to us now, then she could dictate the price here, and the price here would be lowered. If she could do that when she furnished 2,000,000 tons, I do not see why she can not have at least some effect on the price here when she furnishes 1,000,000 tons, as she does now. And especially do I think that some effect upon the price will be felt as soon as this contemplated reduction of 20 per cent in the duty on this enormous total of 1,000,000 tons is put into operation. In like manner it is reasonable to expect a reduction in the cost here of Cuban cigars and cigarette tobacco under the new arrangement, as also of Cuban fruits, sponges, and other dutiable articles which we import from Cuba on a large scale. Speaking in a general way, the amount of the rebates, amounting to several millions of dollars annually, ought to be considered as going into the pockets of our taxpayers. In this way the taxpayers would save 20 per cent of eight millions on sugar alone—that being the amount of revenue realized by our Government at present from the duties of Cuban sugar under the existing tariff rates—unless the sugar trust by some hocus-pocus manages to keep the price up and shoves the 20 per cent of eight millions, or \$1,600,000, into its own capacious pockets. This latter result certainly will not occur after the Democratic party assumes the reins of power in this country in 1905.

Now let us see how reciprocity with Cuba would work from this end of the line. Cuba has a population of about 1,650,000. They consumed in the last fiscal year products of the United States valued at something over \$20,000,000. That, too, happened to be a bad year for us, and our exports to Cuba may be said to average annually \$25,000,000 in value. They consist largely of breadstuffs, coal, cotton manufactures, iron and steel manufactures, machinery of various sorts, leather manufactures, lard, bacon, hams, oils, animals, dairy products, wood manufactures, etc. The Cubans also are importing at present about the same amount, or a little more, of these and other products from the other nations of the world. Is it not to be supposed that with reductions of 20, 25, 30, and 40 per cent in their tariff duties in favor of American goods they would soon be buying much more largely of us, all along the line? It would be contrary to human nature if they should not do so. This country can furnish them with everything they want, and with such reciprocity advantages it is reasonable to believe that that is just what this country will do.

As having an important bearing upon the objects of the pending legislation, I beg to submit in this connection an extract from Dun's International Review for November, 1903, in regard to the resources and future of Cuba, as follows:

The principal elements which determine the commercial future of a country are, its natural resources, proximity to the world's markets and transportation facilities, the intelligence, energy, and thrift of its inhabitants, and the wisdom and honesty of its government. These factors have not been stated in order of relative importance. Considered under these heads, what should be the commercial future of Cuba? This question may best be answered by making an analytic examination of the elements just stated.

The natural resources of Cuba consist of a soil of unsurpassed fertility, less than 10 per cent of which has ever been touched by hoe or plow, and a climate so equable and benignant that the workman can toil without danger to life or very great discomfort, exposed to the rays of a summer midday sun and with no biting frosts to numb his body and limbs in the dawn of a winter

day. The island is seldom visited by disastrous storms or floods, and periods of protracted drought are rare. The advantages of the soil and climate for growing sugar cane are probably unrivaled, while the existence of properties which produce a tobacco of unequalled flavor in that large section of the province of Pinar del Rio known as *vuelta abajo* is too well known to need comment.

The soil and climate of Cuba generally are especially adapted to the cultivation of oranges, pineapples, bananas, and other tropical fruits, while cacao and coffee of excellent quality are grown in the mountainous province of Santiago de Cuba, within whose confines and those of Puerto Principe are still to be found millions of acres of forests of the most valuable hard woods. Henequen, or sisal hemp, grows wild in some parts of Cuba, and the cultivated plant produces a fiber superior in quality to that of Yucatan. Its production will doubtless in time become one of the important industries of the island. Navigable streams are rare, but this is a natural consequence of the narrowness of the island and is not a serious defect, as the north or south coast is within a short distance of almost any point in Cuba. Numerous other advantages of the island could be enumerated, but the most conclusive proof of its resources can best be shown by the Government statistics of its foreign commerce for 1894, the year immediately prior to the outbreak of the last war, which, excluding gold and silver coin, were as follows:

Exports	\$109,192,416.43
Imports	84,229,043.34

leaving a trade balance in favor of Cuba of \$24,963,373.09, or about \$13 per capita. There were export as well as import duties in 1894, and these figures do not represent the true value of imports or exports. Cuba is within three or four days of most of the principal cities of the United States, its natural market, whose population of 80,000,000 could easily consume the entire production of the island. The matter of distance from the markets of Europe is of no great importance, as Cuba's perishable exports have an excellent market in the United States, while the question of time has been solved by rapid steam transportation, and that of rates is being regulated by competition of the increasing number of European lines.

The internal transportation facilities of Cuba have been very deficient up to a recent date and are still far from filling the requirements of the community. The question has been partially solved for a large district in the eastern part of the island, which has heretofore lacked railroad facilities, by the building of the Cuba Railroad, extending from Santa Clara to Santiago de Cuba, with two branch lines nearly completed; and the building of the Cuba Eastern Railroad, now in course of construction; the extension of the Western Railroad, nearing completion. The extension of the Cardenas and Jucaro Railroad to Cienfuegos, shortly to begin, will assist largely in the solution of the question of railroad transportation, while the construction of country roads, in which the Government is showing commendable zeal, is slowly solving the problem for the farmers. Water communication, not only between the ports of the island, but also with the United States and Europe, is increasing, and Cuba has no cause for complaint in that direction.

It must be admitted that on the score of intelligence the masses are somewhat deficient, but this is due largely to the lack of educational facilities from which the country suffered up to the time of American occupation, and as the Government is devoting considerable thought and money to this important subject an improvement in the degree of intelligence is to be expected. The same amount of energy found in the northern climates is not looked for in the Tropics; it does not exist in Cuba, nor is it as necessary where nature is so prodigal and outdoor work can be performed without difficulty twelve months in the year. The Cuban is not a drone, even though he has not the energy of the northern races. In thrift the native of Cuba is more deficient than in either intelligence or energy, but it should be borne in mind that the commerce and even a considerable portion of the agricultural interest of the island are in the hands of Spaniards, the thriftiness of whose middle and lower classes can not be questioned.

Last, but not least, of the factors which contribute to the prosperity of a country are the wisdom and honesty of the governing classes. Considering the lack of experience of the Cubans in self-government, one of the most surprising things is the small number of mistakes which have been made, and their legislation thus far has been very wisely negative; but a very much more surprising fact has been the standard of honesty prevailing in all departments, especially in view of the centuries of corrupt government which they have witnessed. The wisdom and honesty of the administration of the affairs of the Government are attested by the treasury balance of over \$4,000,000, whereas less than \$500,000 was turned over to them in May, 1902, by the American military government. This increase of over \$3,500,000 in less than 18 months has been made without additional taxation, with no decrease in educational facilities or sanitation, and public works have by no means been neglected.

If with a burden of taxation during the later years of Spanish domination known by no other people on earth Cuba prospered and large fortunes were made by the commercial and princely incomes by the agricultural classes, what can be expected under an honest, economical government, with increased population for the cultivation of its wonderfully fertile soil, and improvement in its educational and transportation facilities? Is not a prosperous future assured for a country which can within three years after a most disastrous civil war convert a trade balance of nearly \$22,000,000 against her into a balance in her favor of nearly \$4,000,000?

The external commerce of Cuba was for nearly three centuries confined to the mother country, Spain, and trade with other European countries was permitted only in the latter part of the eighteenth century. Preferential duties were established so strongly in favor of Spain that she continued to furnish most of the imports up to the time of Cuban independence, while for many years past the United States took most of Cuba's exports, the trade balance against the great Republic in its relations with Cuba for the past fifty years being about \$1,500,000,000. During the years 1892-1894, when reciprocal trade relations existed between Cuba and the United States, the latter country furnished about the same percentage of imports as Spain. The imports and exports of Cuba in 1894, the last year of reciprocal trade relations with the United States, were as follows:

Country.	Imports.	Exports.
Spain and possessions	\$32,780,000	\$8,854,000
United States	32,548,000	93,410,000
British Empire	10,842,000	4,501,000
France	1,570,000	1,001,000
Germany	1,500,000	638,000
Other countries	4,989,000	788,000
Total	84,229,000	109,192,000

In 1895, the year following the abrogation of the treaty with the United States, that country took \$95,883,397 of the total of \$110,235,020 exported by Cuba, or about 87 per cent, being greater than during the preceding year,

when reciprocal trade relations between the two countries were in force, but there was a very marked difference in imports as compared with the previous year, as shown by the following table of percentages:

	Per cent.		Per cent.
Spain	50	France	14
United States	25	Germany	14
British Empire	14		

The following table of imports and exports, exclusive of coin, for the four years succeeding a most disastrous civil war indicates the wonderful resources of the country:

Year.	Exports.	Imports.
1890	\$45,067,300	\$66,783,100
1900	48,904,600	66,653,600
1901	63,278,400	66,584,000
1902	64,329,700	60,584,800

The tendency of trade is most clearly shown by the following tables of imports and exports, by percentage, during the same period:

Percentage of imports and exports.

IMPORTS.

	1890.	1900.	1901.	1902.
	Per cent.	Per cent.	Per cent.	Per cent.
United States	43.7	43.8	42.2	41.6
Great Britain	14.7	15.6	14.3	15.2
Spain	16.6	14.7	14.3	15.7
Germany	3	4.5	5.3	6
France	4.2	4.9	4.4	5

EXPORTS.

	1890.	1900.	1901.	1902.
	Per cent.	Per cent.	Per cent.	Per cent.
United States	83	68	76	76.9
Great Britain	5.9	11.2	9.4	9
Spain	2.5	1.6	1.1	1.7
Germany	3.5	11.3	6.7	6.2
France	2.9	2.6	2.1	2

By some writers it is said that the introduction of sugar cane into Cuba was made by Velasquez, the first lieutenant-governor of the island, in 1523, but according to the most authentic Spanish historians its introduction did not take place until the latter part of the sixteenth century, when cuttings were brought from the Spanish colony of Santo Domingo, where its cultivation had been introduced by Columbus nearly a century earlier. For many years its cultivation was confined to very small areas near the principal towns, its limited production being attributed principally to a lack of slaves. In order to stimulate its growth decrees were issued by the Spanish Government granting special privileges to cane planters, among others being the prohibition of attachment for debt of sugar properties or their sale under foreclosure. Notwithstanding this protection and the high price of sugar which prevailed (50 cents per pound having been realized in Spain for the most inferior grades in the latter part of the sixteenth century), the growth of the industry was very slow until the last part of the eighteenth century.

Between 1760 and 1770 exports of sugar amounted to about 3,000 tons per annum, and there was but little increase until after the revolution of the negroes in Santo Domingo, which occurred in 1791. The burning of the cane fields of that island, the emigration of many planters to Cuba, and the issuance of a decree permitting the unrestricted importation of slaves into Cuba for a period of six years gave a great stimulus to the industry. Production increased so rapidly that there was an overproduction in 1808, which, however, was due principally to the severe commercial restrictions then prevailing. This condition of affairs was relieved in 1809, when a decree was issued by the governor of Cuba permitting the shipment of sugar to all countries in vessels of any nationality. The crop continued to increase in size, amounting to 70,000 tons in 1817, and by 1830 it had reached 90,000, becoming Cuba's principal product, thereby displacing coffee, which had previously been the most important crop of the island.

In 1838 an export duty of four-fifths of a cent per pound was levied on sugar if shipped in Spanish vessels, and double that amount in ships of other nationalities. This tax was slowly reduced, but was not abolished until August 1, 1891. The world's sugar crop of 1831 was greater than the consumption, and despite the claim of the Cuban planters that the prices realized were below cost of production they steadily increased its cultivation, and by 1840 the crop amounted to 200,000 tons. The crops by succeeding decades were as follows:

	Tons.		Tons.
1850	300,000	1880	530,000
1860	447,000	1890	632,368
1870	726,000	1900	300,073

The crop of 1902 amounted to 850,181 tons, and that of 1903, most of which has already been shipped, is estimated at from 965,000 to 970,000. The greatest crop in the history of the island was harvested in 1894 and amounted to 1,054,214 tons; the smallest in the past fifty years, amounting to 212,051, was made in 1897. This great decrease in three years was due to the revolution, which devastated the greater portion of the island. The falling off in production from 1870 to 1880 was due to several causes, the principal ones being three cyclones which swept over the island during that decade, the ten years' war, and the freeing of the slaves who fought in that war. There would have been a greater increase between 1880 and 1890 but for the abolition of slavery, which was decreed in 1880.

The increase of 66 per cent between 1890 and 1894 was due to the stimulus given to the industry by the adoption of a treaty of reciprocity with the United States in 1891 whereby Cuban raw sugar was given free entry into that great market. The abrogation of that treaty in 1894 brought about a heavy decline in the price of sugar at the beginning of 1895, the great staple selling for the first time below 2 cents per pound. Principally to this fact is Cuba's last war for independence attributed.

The prices in Habana since 1850 of raw sugar equal in quality to centrifugals of 96 polarization have been as follows:

	Cents.		Cents.
1850	per pound.. 3.50	1900	per pound.. 2.66
1860	do. 4.87	1901	do. 2.20
1870	do. 5.00	1902	do. 1.77
1880	do. 4.87	1903	do. 1.81
1890	do. 2.75		

The quotations above given were the prices on April 1 of each of the years named, that date being selected as being about the middle of the grinding season and representing about the average price realized by the planter for his sugar. The price of cane sugar has lately been controlled by the world's beet-sugar production, which has grown from 50,000 tons in 1840 to 6,146,000 tons in 1901, the last-named amount representing 63.7 per cent of the total sugar production. The very life of the cane sugar industry has been threatened by the European bounty-fed beet sugar. The Cuban crop of 1902 was sold at a loss and the average margin of profit on the crop of 1903 has been small, the fact that any margin was realized being due to the damage to the European sugar-beet crop of last year resulting from unfavorable climatic conditions. The adherence of the various nations represented at the Brussels convention to its action in abolishing bounties on sugar gave the Cuban planter renewed hope, which is further strengthened by the belief that the American Government is at last about to partly fulfill the promises made to its infant protégé by favorable action of the legislative branches on the treaty of reciprocity negotiated between the two countries.

The question as to whether cane sugar can successfully compete in cost of production with beet sugar will be answered in the affirmative or the negative, depending upon the person of whom the question is asked. The man who has lands to sell for sugar-cane cultivation and sugar-mill constructing engineers and promoters will assert that beet sugar can not possibly live without protection, while the average Cuban planter will reply that cane sugar can not be produced here below 2 cents per pound. A European expert, in an article recently published on the beet-sugar industry, states that the average cost of production of beet sugar in Germany is 1.77 cents per pound. That the cost of production in Cuba has been steadily reduced is denied by none, and there is room in most cases for further reduction. The average cost of the crop of 1903 is believed to have been a trifle below 2 cents per pound, and some specially favored plantations doubtless made their sugar at something less than 1½ cents, although it is doubtful if public acknowledgment of this fact would be made by any of them. That sugar can be produced in Cuba at 1½ cents or even lower is not doubted, but in order to do this four conditions will be necessary, viz, land much above the average in fertility, machinery of the most improved type, favorable location, and very efficient management.

The present area of land in Cuba devoted to the cultivation of sugar cane is estimated at 600,000 acres, or something over, and 171 mills ground this year. Santa Clara is the great sugar-producing province of the island, with Matanzas second, the combined crops of the two representing nearly 75 per cent of Cuba's total production. The great province of Puerto Principe, the second in area and first in arable land in the Republic, has but three sugar estates within its boundaries, whereas it is capable of producing a greater crop than is raised by the entire island. About 90 per cent of its soil is virgin land, due to the fact that up to about a year ago it had practically no railroad facilities. During the past two years the sugar production of Santiago Province has been largely increased by the establishment on the northern coast of two of the largest estates in the island, both of which are owned by American corporations, one being the Chaparra Sugar Company, the other the Union Fruit Company, the estate of the latter being known as "Boston." The sugar estate having the largest output the past season was "Caracas," the property of Terry Hermanos, located in the southern portion of the province of Santa Clara, with a production of nearly 80,000 tons.

It is estimated that about 65 per cent of the sugar cane is grown by "colonos," some of whom cultivate on land belonging to the centrals, while others raise the cane on their own land. The latter are known as "independent colonos," and are better paid for their cane as a rule than the tenant planters, receiving from the mill owners in sugar or its equivalent in cash from 5 per cent to 7 per cent of the amount of cane delivered, while the tenant "colono" receives from 4 per cent to 6 per cent, the amount paid in both cases depending on locality.

From lack of funds most Cuban planters allow the cane to rot for too long a period instead of replanting. There is a diversity of opinion as to the length of time cane should be allowed to rot before replanting, but the most intelligent planters seem to think that the best results can be obtained by replanting in from four to seven years, according to the quality of the soil. The custom here is to allow it to rot from eight to twelve and even fifteen to twenty years. Cane has been known to produce in Cuba for a much longer time than the last-named period. The yield of cane decreases yearly after the first year's planting, but the percentage of sucrose is greater in old than in new cane. The average proportion of sugar obtained from cane in 157 centrals grinding in 1901 was 9.71 per cent.

In olden times the juice was extracted from the cane by means of mortar and pestle; later on wooden rollers driven by oxen power were used, and these gave way to iron rollers driven by the same power, which were superseded by the powerful grinding machines known as mills, driven by steam power. There is but one sugar refinery in operation in the island, and this is located at Cardenas and owned by the Cuban Sugar Refining Company. It has a capacity of 400 barrels per day and furnishes practically all of the white sugar used in the island. There is another old refinery at Cardenas, which has not been in operation for some years. There are a number of centrifugals in the island, known as centrifugal turbines, where sugar is whitened to some extent by steam. The island consumes about 40,000 tons per annum.

The amount of capital invested in the sugar industry of the island is estimated at about \$100,000,000, and the value of the crop of 1902 was about \$32,000,000. Cuba's most valuable sugar crop was gathered in 1894, when, according to Government reports, it reached the sum of nearly \$80,000,000, due largely to the fact that it had free entry into the United States. With favorable climatic conditions the next crop will probably reach 1,100,000 tons, which competent authorities believe to be about the limit of production with the present supply of labor. The modification of the immigration laws of the Republic, which are the same as those of the United States, is generally advocated by the planters and commercial classes. The present laws exclude the peasants of the Canary Islands, on whom Cuba has always largely depended for the cultivation of its sugar crop, and more especially for its harvesting.

That the adoption of the pending treaty of reciprocity with the United States would stimulate the industry to some extent is generally admitted, but the pretended fear of the beet-sugar people that their industry would be seriously menaced by a reduction of one-third of a cent per pound of the duties on Cuban sugar is groundless.

Any man who, after reading this description of Cuba's capacities and possibilities, can doubt the value of Cuba's market to us must be of a very incredulous and pessimistic cast of intellect, it seems to me.

Another aspect of the matter which should not be overlooked is this: The Methodist Church and other Protestant denominations are at present expending a great deal of money and effort in the cause of the Americanization of the citizenship of Cuba by sending thither the gospel of religion and the gospel of education. The financial and commercial aid of our Government at this important juncture will tend to accelerate this Christian movement

and to establish still more amicable relations between the people of our own country and the people of this young Republic, which is in reality a ward of the United States.

Another argument in favor of the pending treaty is that it deals in such large measure with the necessities of life. Sugar used to be considered one of the luxuries fifty years ago, but it has grown to be recognized now as an essential of civilization, and a very important one, too. All Americans are free consumers of sugar. In fact, there is no article of food, except perhaps flour, in such general and abundant use in this country as sugar. The tropical fruits of Cuba, too, have become almost a necessity here. Consider the tremendous consumption of bananas in this country, and also of pineapples and coconuts and other Cuban fruits, some of which are dutiable and some not, but all of which will be made more available to our people by such a treaty as is now proposed. Consider also the advantages which it offers to the Cubans in enabling them to get more readily and cheaply all the many necessities of life with which we can and do supply them.

One of the cardinal principles of Democracy is the equal taxation of all, equally collected, either directly or by tariff duties, for the purpose of raising revenue to defray the expenses of an honest government economically administered. As Democrats, we favor this proposed reduction of the tariff on sugar, because it will tend to lighten the burdens of the consumers of sugar in the United States. We only wish that we could have an opportunity to lighten them still further by taking off the differential tax, which, as so clearly and concisely explained on Monday last by the Hon. GEORGE B. McCLELLAN, the recently elected mayor of New York, is the "difference in rate of duty between the refined and unrefined sugars," and thus becomes the measure of "the protection given the sugar refiners of this country." I wish sincerely that we could give the sugar consumers of this country the benefit of this differential protection.

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, let me say that I believe the time ought to come, and will come, when we shall extend this reciprocity principle in every direction, for our own benefit and for the benefit of mankind in general. I believe this great and mighty nation of ours, with its splendid citizenship, its inventive genius, and its wonderful resources, can well afford to invite the trade of the whole world on reciprocal terms, and thereby extend and broaden the markets for our products and attract hither the lion's share of the commerce and trade of all nations as by an irresistible loadstone.

I am proud that the representatives of Democracy in this House have the courage to rise above any prejudice against this measure because it is presented to us by the Republican party and vote for it as "one man" on the high plane that it is, as stated in the beginning of my remarks, a business proposition which, when carried into effect, will do the greatest good to the greatest number and emphasize one of the cardinal principles of Democracy.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. I now yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. SCUDDER].

[Mr. SCUDDER addressed the committee. See Appendix.]

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, this is a very much more important question in its remote bearings than in its immediate presentation. It is well that it should become the vehicle of a good deal of talk on public policy. The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. WATSON] said a moment ago that we upon the Democratic side were anxious merely to talk, and that we had forced upon the House this talking match. Mr. Chairman, I want now to recall the fact, so that the country may distinctly remember it, that as the mouthpiece of this side of the House I asked unanimous consent to give up all our right of talk if we could have granted to us just one vote, a vote upon one single amendment, an amendment for which a great many gentlemen upon that side of the House voted in the Fifty-seventh Congress, an amendment intended to stab at the vitals of the American sugar trust as best we might under the circumstances, an amendment which passed the Fifty-seventh Congress. So that it is not true that the Democracy was not willing to "do business," to use the words of the late lamented Speaker Reed. We are ready to do business now; we are ready to come to any terms whatsoever, almost, if you will just give us a vote, a yea-and-nay vote, upon an amendment of that importance to the American people; an amendment striking out of this bill a precedent of a very grave and evil import, a precedent attempting to bind—ineffectually, but still attempting to bind—the American Congress and the American treaty-making power as to their conduct in the future.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. WATSON], in the course of the even and somewhat rhetorical tenor of his remarks, asked a question. He said, "What is the proper definition of protection?" I shall undertake to answer that question now, and if he is a shorthand reporter I hope he will take the reply down: Protection, Mr. Chairman, is a system of taxation whereby many are robbed in order that a few men may be hotheaded

by legislation into artificial prosperity. [Laughter and applause on the Democratic side.] As a supplementary definition, protection is a system of taxation whereby capital and labor are deflected from naturally profitable pursuits and enterprises into the channels of naturally unprofitable pursuits and enterprises. [Applause and laughter on the Democratic side.] And, as a corollary, the method whereby they are deflected is by the enactment of laws forcing the consumer to pay to the artificial hothoused enterprises a higher price than with a free commerce the consumer would have to pay.

Now, so much for protectionism as an original proposition. Protection is not, however, in this country an original proposition. We are not forming a new government, and we are not framing an absolutely new and revolutionary change of a fiscal system. But that is the definition of original protection, and it is a definition which no fair-minded man can pick a flaw with.

Now, there is one contention made by the Republicans and by the advocates of protectionism everywhere which is true, and it is useless to deny the truth of it. It is true that you can pick out an enterprise and make it more profitable by protectionism. It is also true that you can create an enterprise de novo by protectionism. The only question left is whether you are willing to pay the price. And, if you state the proposition to the people as an original proposition, naming your enterprise and the price to be paid, they would very seldom be willing to enter into the bargain and pay the price.

That brings me, Mr. Chairman, to my favorite banana theory. There is in the United States, I suppose, one hundred acres of land where bananas can be grown in the open air, and yet I could, were I the legislating body of this country, or were I the Czar with absolute power and disposed to make the people pay the price for it, create a "Great American Banana Industry." I could put a tax of one dollar apiece on bananas which are now selling in the streets three for a nickel and inside of five years I could, with a good custom-house service, have created and exploited a vast banana industry. It is true that a great many people who formerly ate bananas could not buy any bananas at all, and some people would have to buy fewer bananas; but it is also true that a great many people, who are plutocrats and aristocrats, would eat them because the common people—Dagoes, Jerseymen, and Mississippians—could not. [Laughter and applause.]

If I continued that system of taxation in existence for twenty years, at the end of that time there would have come to the front a new generation that "knew not Joseph" nor cheap bananas; and the moment sensible people came into power with the idea of revising the banana schedule these gentlemen who "knew not Joseph" and had gone into the American banana business and perhaps formed a banana trust would come to the committee room of the National Legislature, knocking upon the doors all the time, and giving utterance to cries of unutterable woe: "Are you going to strike down the Great American Banana Industry; are you going to reduce the duty from a dollar apiece on bananas to 80 cents? We can't stand it. It will ruin us. Are you going to make the people engaged in banana raising go to the soup houses? Are you going to discriminate in favor of pauper tropical sunshine against self-respecting American hothouse laborers?" [Laughter on the Democratic side.]

Let us stop a moment and follow the banana theory a little further, because I am fond of bananas. [Laughter.] What would have been the result of establishing that industry? Merely this, that you would have deflected a certain amount of American capital and a certain amount of American labor engaged in the general hothouse industry into a different channel of hothouse proceedings, and instead of having their hothouses for the purpose they have them now they would have converted them into banana nurseries, and the consumers would be paying a dollar apiece, or perhaps 90 cents apiece, for bananas, because the protected interest would have to undersell somewhat the foreign markets.

After fifteen or twenty years "home competition" would have reduced the price of bananas in the American market to, let us say, 40 cents apiece, and then Republican orators and politicians would say privately, in newspapers, and on the stump and within these walls, with due solemnity and without a mutual smile: "Lo, and behold! See how a protective tariff has reduced the price of bananas from 90 cents apiece in 1950 to 40 cents apiece in 1965—nearly 50 per cent decrease in price to the consumer! Protection did it!"

Yes! A reduction from superlative extortion to comparative extortion!

But in all this picture keep in mind one thing: While protectionism lasted bananas would never reach three for a nickel, because if they did, that public enemy—tropical sunshine—would be master.

What would you have accomplished? Would you have increased the wages of labor? Not a particle. You would merely have deflected capital from one channel to another, from one sort

of hothouse production to another, or from a production which was not hothoused at all into a hothouse production. Would you have increased the demand for labor? Not at all, because this capital and this labor would have gone out of something else—something that with freer commerce or with free commerce would have been naturally profitable—into this business, which, otherwise unprofitable, you have by law made profitable. Yet it would be true that these people, having been deceived into that occupation by law, ought not to have the entire scaffold cut down under them all at once. It was not their fault that this pernicious and miserable "abomination of abominations" in the way of a fiscal system existed. They had merely taken advantage of the situation which the laws of the country furnished them, and they ought to be reduced down to the competitive point of the banana trade by slow processes, but brought there after a while.

Now, my friends, I have given you the whole definition and an illustration of the manner of working of the protective tariff wherever it is needed. Now, wherever it is not needed, wherever a man could make a reasonable profit without a protective tariff, then, of course, you merely enable him by tariff taxation to tax the home consumer up to the point of foreign competition and do as a great many corporations do in divers businesses—recoup from us, while selling to the foreigners cheaper. And so stands the great Republican party to-day with a dozen industries, which, by changed conditions, have gotten to where they can support themselves in the home and foreign markets both. The great steel industry ships its products all over the world. The great American boot and shoe industry shipped, as the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GROSVENOR] said, \$7,000,000 worth, or even a greater amount, to foreign ports last year. Now, one of two things necessarily happens when this occurs. Either the manufacturers do not need the protection, because they can vie with the foreigner and the "pauper labor" of the foreigner, after paying freight across the ocean, in his own market; and if they can, then certainly they can vie with him in the American market, after he has paid the freight across the ocean; either that is the case, or else they do need the protection and are selling below cost to the foreigner or below a fair profit and making up their losses on us at home.

If they are selling below a fair profit, then in order to carry on their business abroad and here they must recoup at my expense and your expense as general consumers, and it is the tariff that enables them to do it. My friends, you have gone on for years howling about giving the American market to the American manufacturer and the American producer. You have come to the point in connection with the barbed-wire industry, the nail industry, the steel-rail industry, the locomotive industry, the telephone and graphophone, and sewing-machine, and boot and shoe industries, and a great many others that I could mention, where those who control those industries have the foreign as well as the home market, and you are still keeping the tariff up. Why? Why? Because you dare not "disturb existing conditions," as you say. That is not it. It is because you dare not disturb the existing tariff schedule lest you "open the doors." That is the truth, isn't it—lest you open the doors? That is what you are afraid of. You are not afraid about reducing the duty on boots and shoes.

To-day there is not a boot and shoe man in Massachusetts who would not tell you he can get along very well without it. There is not a Southern cotton man manufacturing heavy cotton goods that will not tell you he is shipping his goods to China in competition with the entire world. But you are afraid that if you open the doors, instead of stopping at the reduction of duties on those things, the people will go further and reduce them upon things where you think an artificial, hothouse enterprise would be by legislation knocked out of existence. Now, that is the truth. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. WARSON] first denied what I had said, that the Republicans were tariff schedule fetish worshipers. I do not mean that you actually do bow down every morning and every night and erect a little bit of an image of the tariff schedule. I do not mean that you take a picture of a boot or shoe with the per cent marked on the sole and literally worship it. Most of you do not bow down to anything, particularly—[laughter]—and therefore you do not bow down to boots and shoes and the schedules. [Laughter.] But what I mean is this, that you have put into utterance the slogan, "Stand pat." Why? Are you afraid of the common sense of the American people? Are you afraid of your own common sense when you are in power?

Gentlemen tell us that whenever the tariff is to be reduced and its iniquities and injustices disposed of, it shall be done by its friend, the Republican party. Well, its friend, the Republican party, is in power now, with a very large majority here and a very large one over in the Senate, and with an immense majority at the White House—[laughter]—a very "strenuous" majority of one—e pluribus unum—disregardful of international and

national relations of all sorts, it is true, but still a purely Republican majority. Can't you trust him? Can he not trust you? Can't you and the Senate trust one another? Why don't you go to work and do this revising? Why? You are afraid that the men who helped you in the campaign with campaign funds may persuade their laborers that you would hurt them, and that they themselves will refuse to contribute to your campaign fund if you "revise" before election. Isn't it a real nice thing for politicians to talk honestly to one another, gentlemen? That is what is the matter, isn't it? [Laughter.]

Now, Mr. Chairman, this debate seems to have proceeded with the idea that sugar was the only thing in the world, and the only thing in this reciprocity treaty or in this bill. Gentlemen seem to have forgotten that the duty on all articles of whatsoever nature, and refined sugar even, is reduced by this bill 20 per cent. Gentlemen seem to have forgotten that we are making a market in Cuba for Western farm produce and for Southern cottons and cotton-seed oil. Gentlemen seem to have forgotten everything but sugar. Some of my friends on this side have caused me to recall a thing that I had not heard for years, but which came back to my mind while they were talking. In the early days of the Republic of Texas some English noblemen were traveling through that country. They were entertained by one of the local magnates who had settled there, and he took the English noblemen down to the only "gentlemen's club" existing at that time within the confines of the Republic—the public barroom; and while down there he concluded he would impress the barkeeper with the magnitude of his social standing. So he turned to one of them and said:

"My lord, I believe you are a marquis in your own country?"

"Yes."

"And, my lord, I believe you are an earl at home?"

"Yes."

Then he said, "Jim, these are marquises and earls. What do you think of that?"

Jim said, "Oh, well, I don't care much about that. There ain't but two classes of men in this place. One is them that takes sugar in theirn, and the other is them as ain't so durned particular." [Laughter.]

Now, I belong to the class that has a very tender and soft feeling for the sugar in a great many things, but I am very much like that man. I would not neglect the real solid elements that enter into the composition simply for the sake of the sugar. [Laughter.]

Now, one of my friends on this side said something about the probable position on this question of the greatest Democrat that ever existed, except He who was both God and man, and he absolutely seemed to think that that great Democrat agreed with him about his position in opposition to this bill. Let me call the attention of my friend to some of the language of Thomas Jefferson upon this identical sort of question. He says:

Such being the restrictions on our commerce—

Just the situation we are in now, the Republican party in power—restrictions upon our commerce—unable to start de novo; where we could not if we would, and would not if we could, totally reverse the engine, because it would mean revolution and destruction to a very large extent, but desirous of having freer relations with the world; Mr. Jefferson says—

the question is, in what way may they best be removed, modified, or counteracted?

As to commerce, two methods occur. First, by friendly arrangements with the several nations with whom these restrictions exist; or, second, by the separate act of our own legislatures for countervailing their effects.

There can be no doubt—

Under these restrictions, at that time—

but that of the two, friendly arrangement is now the most eligible. Instead of embarrassing commerce under piles of regulating laws, duties, and prohibitions, could it be relieved from all its shackles in all parts of the world, could every country be employed in producing that which nature has best fitted it to produce, and each be free to exchange with others mutual surpluses for mutual wants, the greatest mass possible would then be produced of all of those things which contribute to human life and human happiness; the numbers of mankind would be increased, and their conditions bettered.

Then he goes on:

Would even a single nation begin with the United States this system of free commerce, it would be advisable to begin it with that nation; since it is one by one only that it can be extended to all.

It is one by one only, my friends, that under a Republican Administration you can procure conditions of freer commerce with the nations of the world.

Some nation—

Mr. Jefferson proceeds—

not yet ripe for free commerce in all its extent, might still be willing to mollify its restrictions and regulations for us, in proportion to the advantages which an intercourse with us might offer. Particularly they might concur with us in restricting the duties to be levied on each side, or in compensating any excess of duty by equivalent advantages of another nature. Our commerce is certainly of a character entitling it to favor in most countries.

Now, my friends upon this side more especially, listen, and I want to call attention of gentlemen on that side, too, to a very interesting letter written by one Augustus G. Payne, acting president of the great American Protective Tariff League, an organization for the purpose of keeping up the indissoluble bond of union between legislative robberies, lest if one were turned down all might, in the course of time, go. I wish to read it for the benefit of both sides:

[The American Protective Tariff League. Devoted to the Protection of American Labor and Industries. National headquarters, No. 339 Broadway, between Worth and Leonard streets.]

NEW YORK, November 17, 1903.

DEAR SIR: The American Protective Tariff League concerns itself with no special industry or group of industries. It concerns itself with all industries. It is supported by the friends of protection in every part of our country and especially by the small manufacturers who have done so much to develop our country.

It aims to make popular the protective tariff system, and has always remained consistent with its record and its principles. The development of a small industry which has a right to live on American soil is as much the concern of the league as the prosperity of mighty enterprises.

It is because it believes that a reciprocity treaty or reciprocity legislation which permits the introduction into this country on a favored basis of articles which we ourselves are producing is to deny to a certain extent or to forget for the time being the great principle of protection. Reciprocity in competitive products, whatever else it may do, can not possibly harmonize with protection.

Nor can such a proceeding, from the standpoint of protection, be justified, no matter what its source, no matter how deserving its objects, no matter how specially advantageous as respects any present commercial advantage to ourselves, no matter what party cry is heard. Exceptional conditions can not excuse and will not help us.

The principle is denied; that is the serious fact. It will not merely return to plague us; it is here and will remain plaguing us, perhaps to our undoing. No doubt of it.

Every tariff reformer favors Cuban reciprocity because it is tariff reform and not protection. When we find both protectionists and tariff reformers voting for a tariff measure—one asserting that the measure is not out of tune with protection and the other hailing it as a real advance toward free trade—we may be sure that one or the other is mistaken.

The spirit of 1892, when protection had gone out of fashion, seems to be in the air. Cuban reciprocity will do more to undo the tariff in 1904 than a sated and complacent prosperity did in 1892.

Sincerely, yours,

AUGUSTUS G. PAYNE,
Acting President.

HON. ALBERT S. BURLESON, M. C., Washington, D. C.

Reciprocity in competitive products, whatever else it may do, can not possibly harmonize with protection. Nor can such a proceeding, from the standpoint of protection, be justified.

Mark this:

No matter what its source, no matter how deserving its object, no matter how specially advantageous as respects any present commercial advantage to ourselves, no matter what party cry is heard, exceptional conditions can not excuse and will not help us. The principle is denied; that is the serious, the eventful, fact. It will not merely return to plague us; it is here and will remain plaguing us, perhaps to our undoing.

God grant it! [Laughter and applause on the Democratic side.] It is true, my friends the enemy, that your "principle is denied," and it is "a serious and eventful fact," and that is why I say this bill is more important in its remote bearings than in its present consideration. If that great man, Mr. James G. Blaine, had lived and had the power to do as he proposed, although he would not have done it purposely and willingly, if he had carried out the policy that he had in his mind, he would have sapped and undermined your entire wall of protectionism fortifications and they would have crumbled to the ground after a while; because just as surely as you take one man out of the shelter of it and his self-interest no longer appeals to him or he finds that he prospers without it, he becomes one of the great body of the people, ceases to be one of a peculiar class that is "protected," and then he ceases to give you his political support. Reading further from this letter, this gentleman says:

Cuban reciprocity will do more to undo the tariff in 1904 than a sated and complacent prosperity did in 1892.

My friends on the Democratic side of this Chamber, with Jefferson indorsing our position and the Great American Association of Tariff Barons—the Protective Tariff League—opposing it, how can we doubt ourselves?

I want to say a few words about the "sated and complacent prosperity" in 1892. My friend from Georgia [Mr. MADDOX] will remember how complete "the sated and complacent prosperity" was in Georgia and in Mississippi at that time, with cotton selling at less than the labor cost of production. Gentlemen from Kansas will remember that about that time the people in Kansas were burning corn for fuel, because it cost less to burn it than to sell it. They will remember that the people were restless and in their desperation were grasping at desperate remedies; that it was a time when subtreasury schemes and State socialism were preached and indorsed all over the West and South. You will remember that because of the hard conditions of the people in 1889, and in 1890 and 1891, they threw your party out of power.

You will remember that Harrison himself said in a newspaper interview, which I read and have never seen denied, that the reason he was thrown out of power and Cleveland was elected was because of the unprecedented hard times and suffering, for which the people of the South and West, without due reason, held

his Administration responsible. Yet the gentleman from Ohio gets up here and tells you that when Cleveland came into power the country was in a condition of great prosperity, and this president of the Associated Order of Tariff Barons and Beggars speaks of the "sated and complacent prosperity of 1892." Why, Mr. Chairman, those hard times were not confined to the United States. The Baring Brothers broke; there was disaster and panic in Australia and in the Argentine Republic and all over the world, and it reached us last because we were the strongest nation and best able to stave it off, but when it reached us we got a very great dose of it.

The entire world had been on a boom during the seventies and early eighties. Towns had been laid out in Virginia and West Virginia and are still "laid out," and for eligible sites 3 miles out from an imaginary town site people had paid \$20 and \$30 a front foot. All this collapsed, and lo! disaster. If you do not mind you are riding to the same sort of a fall now, and notwithstanding all your eulogies of the great "prosperity" that exists largely in your minds, a collapse will come. The people are finding that by your laws you encourage and keep in power not only monopoly, but, because of the tactics which you have pursued, monopolies which are public swindles and "get-rich-quick" cheats.

There are States which permit the formation of trusts and yet deny them the right to do business within their own confines; do not permit them to do business in the State of their birth, but create them under the safeguards of the Federal interstate-commerce laws to do business in Mississippi, Texas, and Nevada—combinations that have for their sole purpose nothing else than harmful action to the consumer. There is a rotten system for you which must eventually collapse. God grant when the general collapse comes that only the speculators, the bankers furnishing them with the money to finance concerns that are not worth three cents on the dollar, may be injured. Yet men who do this sort of thing are considered to be the great "financiers" of this country.

I want to call your attention to something in Mr. Harrison's message in the year 1889. I find in his message of 1892 that he says our receipts from customs had fallen off \$42,000,000 and some odd hundred thousands, the net loss of revenue from all sources being \$32,675,972 and some cents.

Mr. Harrison went into office with one hundred and some odd million dollars lying in the Treasury over and above the gold reserve, and he went out of power with between two and three million dollars over and above the gold reserve in the Treasury of the United States, and yet gentlemen get up here and talk about "the great prosperity of 1892," "the sated and complacent prosperity of that year."

Now, I say I like to hear the gentleman from Ohio, General GROSVENOR. He is such a magnificently bold and serene prophet. I myself hardly ever prophesy, and for this reason. I had an old friend in Mississippi, one of those men who speak magnificent common sense in rather bad English—and there are a great many of them through this country—and he said: "John, you have been elected to Congress; now, don't go and turn prophet; prophets is mostly darn fools, and they find it out themselves when the thing they prophesy don't come to pass." [Laughter.] But my friend from Ohio is the most exuberant and unscrupulous prophet that this part of the world ever saw. [Laughter.] I can not follow him in that, because I could not beat him at it if I wanted to, and besides that, even my association with the Republican membership of this House, which is of the kindest and most friendly character, has not got me to the point where I am utterly disregarding of some desire to be justified by future events. [Laughter.]

Now, my friends, the gentleman from Ohio makes a defense for Calico Charlie Foster which does Calico Charlie proud, and he has called Charlie Foster to make it himself. Unfortunately, it happens to be an afterthought in the face of Secretary Foster's testimony. I find in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of March 23, 1897, this order put into the RECORD, sent for by a messenger on that day, and those of you that were here at the time will remember it. Here it is. There is no denying it, for it can not be denied.

SIR: You are hereby authorized and directed to prepare designs for the 8 per cent bonds provided in Senate amendment to the sundry civil bill now pending.

Remember, now, that it was in obedience to an amendment in the Senate. The Senate had provided for a bond issue by an amendment, which was in process of becoming a law, and Secretary Foster issued this order. I continue to read:

This authority is given in advance of the enactment in view of the pressing contingency.

This is dated February 20, 1892. The election did not take place until the succeeding November. Now, even my friend General GROSVENOR can not bring a witness into court to deny by an afterthought his own handwriting and his own statement made at that time.

But, Mr. Chairman, that is not all of this. Secretary Foster on the hearing before the committee, when he was before that committee, said:

Now, I want to say to you that these estimates are based upon conditions existing prior to the late election.

That is what he said in his testimony—not as an afterthought now—in a letter to General GROSVENOR in view of influencing political conduct now. Mr. Foster can not be heard now to deny his then statement that the "conditions existed prior to the election." Then later he was cross-examined, and in answer to a question as to whether there would be a deficit or not, he says: "I should say the next fiscal year would show a deficit."

Mr. TURNER. Can you give an approximate estimate according to all the data accessible to you?

Mr. SECRETARY FOSTER. I will only say this, that if I was to have the management of the Treasury I should insist upon an increase of revenue to the extent of \$50,000,000.

A MEMBER. What are you reading from?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. I am reading from a speech in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of March 25, 1897, by Mr. Dockery, of Missouri, he having placed these documents there on that day. It says that he sent to the Treasury Department for the original Foster order, and it came. My friend from New York [Mr. PAYNE] will remember that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GROSVENOR] then disputed Mr. Dockery's statement, and that Mr. Dockery sent a messenger down to the Treasury Department to get the original letter of Secretary Foster and the hearings before the committee, and it was all brought here and sprung upon the House that day like a bombshell.

Mr. BARTLETT. The speech shows that the messenger was sent for them.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. I know it, and gentlemen who were here at the time will remember it. My friend from Ohio, General GROSVENOR, was still denying it, and I reckon he will go on denying it until the last minute.

My friend from Ohio then attempts to explain how it was that we sold goods cheaper abroad, and he had an illustration or an analogy, and said that he had known "goods are sold cheaper in the spring time" than in the balance of the year. Unfortunately these goods do not happen to be shipped abroad exclusively in the spring time; some go on "other days."

My friend from Ohio says that with the Republican tariff law foreign trade has grown immensely. Oh, my friends, that rises above a jest. How foolish and how partisan that is! Under all sorts of administrations and under all sorts of tariff laws the foreign trade of this country has gone forward, growing by leaps and bounds, pari passu with the growth of the country. This country at the period he was speaking of as being at one end of his comparison had some three millions of population, at another period ten millions of population, and at another one twenty millions.

The other end of his comparison is the present.

It has eighty-five million souls now. It has four times the amount of territory that it had at the beginning. It had, let us say, about three million workers in the fields of industry in the forties. It now has twenty, and yet gentlemen want to claim great Republican credit because "our foreign commerce has grown." Would it not have been remarkable if it had not grown? Let me tell you something, gentlemen, in all due honesty. There are 385 politicians in this end of the Capitol and there are 90 at the other wing, and if every one of them were to die to-morrow, and not another Senate or House were to be elected for twenty years, and the laws were to be left just as they are, or if they were left as they would be after the Democrats had come into power and changed them, this great country would go on prospering. [Applause on the Democratic side.] To show how prosperity comes anyhow, we have prosperity in both home and foreign trade in spite of a large measure of Republican hindrance.

It would go on prospering because of the magnificently extensive area in which there is absolutely free, unrestricted, and untrammelled trade. [Applause on the Democratic side.] The world has never seen anything like it. It would go on prospering because it is a country of cheap land; and labor and wages are dependent in the ultimate analysis upon the price at which land can be bought or can be rented. Man does not get out of agriculture—out of the primitive and best condition of man—and into other businesses unless he is paid to do it by greater compensation. If a man can get land cheap, he can defy anybody that wants to tyrannize over him in regard to his wages by going upon the land and either buying it or renting it or entering it as a homestead.

It will continue to be prosperous for another reason—because we are the one people on the globe, except some of our British cousins in the colonies, where there is absolutely no caste, where a man knows that although he is working to-day pegging shoes he may the next year be governor or something of that sort, and that

if he is not, his children may be almost anything—millionaires or presidents. Men work with hope and with incentive when they know that they are not confined within unclimbable walls, and will continue to work. So I say that it is folly and partisanship to stand before the great American people and the world claiming the benefit of everything—our growth and even the discovery of gold in Alaska, and the invention of the cyanide process of getting more gold out of a given quantity of ore or getting it out of intractable ore, and the benefit of all the inventions and all the progress of the world as fruits of tariff legislation simply because you have been in power for the Lord knows how long. Meanwhile we and the world have been growing in spite of you. "I bade him mark that the thrushes still sang."

Mr. LACEY. Will the gentleman yield to a question?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Certainly.

Mr. LACEY. I know that the gentleman does not desire to make an argument based on a mistake.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Certainly not.

Mr. LACEY. He has made a mistake of just one year in Foster's letter. The gentleman has based his argument on the statement that Foster's letter was written in 1892, when, as a matter of fact, it was written in February, 1893.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi (after examining the RECORD). The gentleman is right, I see by reference to the RECORD. I regret exceedingly to have made the mistake. The date is a little blurred in my copy. The letter was written in February, 1893.

Mr. LACEY. Just about a week before Mr. Cleveland's inauguration.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. I am very glad to have had the mistake called to my attention.

Mr. BOWIE. But Harrison was still President. [Laughter on the Republican side.]

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. I am very glad the gentleman from Iowa has called my attention to that, because I would not want an error to go uncorrected into the RECORD, and, frankly, my argument at that particular point was to a large extent based on the error now called to my attention.

Mr. LACEY. I do not want my friend, whom I admire so much, to make a mistake thus early in his leadership.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Well, I have one consolation about that, and the country may share that consolation. If a fellow on this side of the Chamber makes a mistake in his leadership he does not get many followers, but when a leader makes a mistake on that side of the Chamber you all follow him like sheep. [Prolonged laughter and applause.] So I feel to a certain extent that I am in the hands of God and my friends. [Laughter and applause.]

One amusing thing about this debate is one of the explanations given by one of my friends over there—I think it was my friend whom I like very much, very much indeed, Mr. GARDNER of Michigan. He is for this bill now, while he was not for it before, because they put in the five-year clause, which prevents them from changing the legislation in the meanwhile.

In other words, a year ago the cry was, "For heaven's sake do not enact this legislation; it will ruin us;" and now he comes in and says, "Well, it won't ruin us except for five years, and that is all right." [Laughter.]

Talking about amending the treaty, my friend from Pennsylvania [Mr. DALZELL] said of course I knew it would have to go back to the treaty powers. Of course it would, but I am informed that that very proviso sought to be amended—that proviso in article 8—was put on by the Senate as an amendment to the treaty, so having already one amendment on it, with one more amendment you could get the treaty back just as quick.

Mr. PAYNE. Oh, no; it has already been to Cuba and has been ratified.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. With that part of it in it?

Mr. PAYNE. Yes.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Then my friend from Georgia [Mr. BARTLETT] had a different idea.

Mr. BARTLETT. That was an amendment put on by the Senate on the 19th of January, 1903.

Mr. PAYNE. Yes, but it has been to Cuba since and has been ratified there.

Mr. BARTLETT. When it came over to this country first it was not on the bill.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. All right. It has been amended once, but that amendment you say has already received the confirmation of the Cuban government. Still it was put on in the Senate, and if the Senate can amend it, why, then, surely the gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE] ought to be willing to say that the House can, because he is peculiarly the man that has always stood for the principle, about the accuracy of which, by the way, I am not certain, that the House of Representatives in connection with matters of this sort has equal power with the Senate and stands upon an exactly equal footing and must be first

consulted. So if the Senate could amend it, why, then, the House ought to be able to amend it too, if the gentleman from New York is right.

Mr. PAYNE. Will the gentleman allow me a word?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Certainly.

Mr. PAYNE. Of course the House can amend it, but then it must go to the Senate.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. But how if your Senate will accept the amendment—your Senate for which you are responsible as a party? It ought to accept it. I expect it would now, because they have had time to talk the matter over since they acted before and found out that the sugar trust really will be hurt by this amendment, and I know so well this Republican Senate that I believe if they would find out that they really could thereby hurt the sugar trust they would adopt the amendment in a minute. We have convinced them of it now.

As Cuba has managed to exist since the time when the gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE] informed the House last Congress that if we did not act in very short order she would cease to exist—as she has managed to exist during this intervening time, could she not manage to exist three weeks longer, until we could cable back and forth a confirmation of this little amendment?

Mr. PAYNE. Now, the gentleman knows that that process would take months.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Suppose it did take months.

Mr. PAYNE. In the meantime the sugar crop would be harvested and gathered, and you would be declaiming against the sugar trust that it had bought up all the sugar.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. How long it would take depends—

Mr. PAYNE. The gentleman is trying to help the sugar trust by his amendment.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Well, if I am, the Lord knows I am unconscious of it. [Laughter.]

But I will say in answer to my friend from New York [Mr. PAYNE] that the length of time it would take would depend upon the care and strenuousness brought into action at the other end of the Avenue. If you could just halfway approximate the celerity that has lately actuated this Administration in connection with the new-born Republic of Panama, you would have it back here in three days. [Laughter and applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. PAYNE. Oh, well, but the minds of the mighty czars in another place have not operated on this Panama business yet, and they have operated on this treaty.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. They will operate quickly in some way or other, provided the trust is not hurt. [Laughter and applause on the Democratic side.] They are waiting for us. Now one of my friends says that this is an unconstitutional bill, because the Constitution of the United States says that "all bills raising revenue shall originate" in the House of Representatives. The Constitution of the United States says that, but it does not say anything but that. It says all "bills" raising revenue shall originate in the House of Representatives. It does not say that all treaties raising revenue shall originate here. The treaty-making power is given in the Constitution without limitation, save the limitations to the Federal Government itself. The treaty-making power in its exercise was hedged in by the necessity of a two-thirds majority in the Senate, and although I have not studied the question out far enough to know, our forefathers may have thought that that safeguard was sufficient; that while they would not let the Senate, by a bare majority, representing only the States and not the people, originate a revenue measure, they would let them do it by a two-thirds majority, which would in all cases probably carry as an incident a majority of the population of the country.

Now I dwell upon that for this reason: I am known to be a stickler for the Constitution. I have spoken of you gentlemen over there as schedule fetich worshippers. I am, perhaps, a Constitution fetich worshiper—one of the very few left. There are some few on this side. I hope that they will grow in numbers in the course of time. But I have always thought that the Constitution was superior to any temporary whim of the people themselves, and certainly superior to any temporary whim of Congress; and if I thought that this was an unconstitutional measure, it should not have my vote if the whole Democratic party depended upon it, and if my seat depended upon it, and if a great deal of everything that I hold most dear in the world depended upon it. But there is nothing in that.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Will my friend permit a question?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Yes.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. In connection with your discussion of the constitutional question, I would like to ask the gentleman from Mississippi if he has not forgotten that clause of the Constitution which confers upon Congress the right to levy and collect duties? Is not that an exclusive prerogative in Congress?

Does not the mentioning of one thing in an organic instrument of that kind exclude that power from any other?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Oh, no! Every Federal power that is conferred upon Congress in the Constitution—nearly every one of them—is unquestionably subject to execution by the treaty-making power of the country as well. This is the only one that has ever been questioned, namely, the one with reference to the raising of revenue. The others are not even questioned by anybody. Perhaps the powers are concurrent. I am not passing upon this question, however, understand me.

Let us see:

For example, Congress is expressly granted the power to "establish a uniform rule of naturalization," to "coin money and regulate the value thereof," to "establish post-offices and post-roads," to "define and punish piracies and felonies on the high seas and offenses against the laws of nations," and yet there has never been any dispute about the fact that the treaty-making power of the United States can enter into conventions and treaties with foreign countries concerning naturalization of our citizens there and of their citizens here.

A few years ago you will remember that there was very much talk about "international bimetalism" to be arrived at by treaty between the great nations of the world. Nobody disputed or dreamt of disputing the power of the United States to enter by treaty into such an arrangement, although it involved coinage of money and the regulation of the value thereof. We have a half dozen postal conventions and treaties with foreign countries, and no one has ever disputed our authority to make them. We have many treaties defining certain things as "piracies and felonies upon the high seas"—for example, the African slave trade—and yet all of these powers are expressly granted to Congress in the Constitution, just as is the power to regulate interstate and foreign commerce, and to levy and collect duties.

If one is an exclusive grant it seems to me that all are. In other words, the grant to the President and the Senate to make treaties is a broad, general grant in express words, and it is unlimited by other express words or by any necessary intendment, except the limitations upon the power of the Federal Government itself.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Will the gentleman permit one more question?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Yes.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. The power to levy and collect duties is in express terms conferred on Congress, and is in express terms conferred nowhere else throughout that instrument. Now, as I understand you, you hold that by implication that is qualified in a subsequent clause which gives to the President and the Senate the right to make treaties.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. I do not care to get off from the line of my argument. There are a dozen places in the Constitution where express powers are conferred upon Congress, and during the entire history of this country the treaty-making power has dealt with the subject-matter of those grants to Congress.

Now, one gentleman on this side reads a Democratic platform and he says the Democratic party has pronounced against reciprocity. When I read it I find it to be that the Democratic party declared against "sham Republican reciprocity"—that is, a reciprocity treaty that did not reciprocate; a treaty that did not give anything, did not concede anything in the way of a real reduction of duties in America, nor really extend our markets abroad, and treaties, therefore, which did not help the American consumer nor the American producer.

One gentleman says that this is a Republican bill. Now, Mr. Chairman, I do not care about the source of any measure. I think that the man who serves his country best serves his party best, and if a man can not serve his party in that way—if he has a party which can not be served that way—I think the sooner he gets out of that party the better. I know that the Democratic party is not that sort of a party. [Loud applause.]

I do not care about the source of a measure, if it is right, and the gentleman's argument would lead him to take the same position as he takes now if faced with the question of reducing the duty on barbed wire or nails, or agricultural implements—of refusing to do it because it was piecemeal in the first place, and in the second place, the recommendation was sent from a Republican President.

I am glad to see a Republican President, especially this one, have a lucid interval, and I am glad to see a Republican majority in this House share his lucidity for a short while. [Loud and long-continued applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. McCALL. Mr. Chairman, it is not my purpose to follow the wide range of this debate and discuss the great variety of subjects that have been brought before the committee. I shall, however, depart from the line of speaking with reference to this bill and refer to the definition of protection which was given by

the distinguished gentleman from Mississippi who has just addressed the House. He regarded protection as a hothouse policy, and illustrated his definition very aptly by the article of bananas. Bananas, I believe, have been upon the free list for nearly twenty years, and there has been no attempt to stimulate their production in this country.

The sane idea of protection is to attempt to establish only those industries which by nature we are fitted to carry on in this country. Probably in the course of time, in a geologic age or two, when the ores of the older portions of the world had been exhausted, our own resources might have come into play. But the American people are rather an ambitious people; they did not care to wait some thousands of years, and they adopted the policy of protection at first, a rather heroic policy, so that we have witnessed as a result of its application in this country an industrial development that never before was seen in the world, and we have also incontestably witnessed a cheapening in the cost of production.

But to turn to the bill before the House, which deals with an important volume of trade between two countries, a trade that now amounts to nearly a hundred million dollars a year, and under the policy of this measure is destined greatly to increase. If the trade aspect of this bill were its most important aspect it would not have deserved a tithe of the attention it has received from the country. It has appealed powerfully to the sentiment of the American people, and for the last two years no other subject has been so widely discussed. It has been supported by two Presidents in succession, and has been made the central policy of the Administration of the present Executive, who has adhered to it with a persistency and fidelity that do him honor. It occasioned in the last Congress one of the most angry controversies ever witnessed in Congress.

Surely he must be an ambitious statesman who would not be content to solve such an important question as this one in a single measure, but who would desire to have a measure dealing not only with Cuba, but incidentally with the rest of mankind. Closure and drastic rules against amendments are weapons to be resorted to on rare occasions, but I think the Republican party, which is responsible for legislation here, is to be congratulated that it has asked the House to devote itself to a single great purpose in order that this great question, that has been discussed for the last two years, shall at last be finally settled.

The gentleman from Missouri explained the tactics of the minority when he said that the way to defeat this measure was to adopt the amendment proposed by the minority. I know of no one, either in this House or out of it, who can employ language more accurately than the gentleman from Missouri, and he expressed the exact purpose of that amendment.

As the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means has explained to the House, the amendment with reference to the five years' provision would make it necessary to have a new convention with Cuba; the present convention having already been ratified by both Governments, a new convention would have to be made. This would create delay. The Cuban question would be returned to the condition it was in two years ago. In the meantime the sugar crop that is being harvested in Cuba would not come under the terms of this bill, and there would be a serious loss to Cuba. So, I say, let us trifle no longer with the hope of Cuba kindled by us two years ago and deferred and deferred again until her heart is sick. Let us redeem the pledges we have made, if not to Cuba, at least to the American people in Cuba's behalf, and pass this bill without further delay. I am somewhat surprised at the attitude of the gentleman from Mississippi who has just taken his seat, concerning the power of the treaty-making department of this Government to pass laws for the internal government of the United States.

It is a singular position for the gentleman to take, if I have not misunderstood him, that the Executive and Senate, under the guise of making treaties, can pass in secret taxation laws for the American people. James A. Garfield, one of the greatest political scholars who ever sat in this House, once declared that the infringement by the Senate on the constitutional prerogative of the House in raising revenue, if assented to by us, would inflict a fatal wound on our system of government. I submit that if we concede to the Senate the right to pass legislation by treaty and the right to impose taxation by treaty we will have surrendered the last vestige of popular representative government in the United States. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Let me quote to you some old-fashioned doctrine on this point from a report that has been brought to my attention by my colleague on the Committee on Ways and Means, the gentleman from Pennsylvania. A treaty was pending before the Senate with Prussia and other States of the Germanic federation, and the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations made this report to the Senate through Rufus Choate, one of the greatest lawyers who ever sat in that body and the greatest advocate who ever spoke

at the American bar. I ask your attention while I read briefly from what Mr. Choate says:

In the first place, the committee propose to confine themselves to a very brief exhibition of another and single ground upon which, without reference to the particular merits of the treaty, they advise against its ratification.

Then he adds:

The convention which has been submitted to the Senate changes duties which have been laid by law. It changes them either ex directo and by its own vigor, or it engages the faith of the nation and the faith of the Legislature through which the nation acts to make the change. In either aspect it is the President and Senate who, by the instrumentality of negotiation, repeal or materially vary regulations of commerce and laws of revenue which Congress had ordained. * * *

Without engaging at all in an examination of the extent, limits, and objects of the power to make treaties, the committee believe that the general rule of our system is indisputably that the control of trade and the function of taxing belong, without abridgment or participation, to Congress. They infer this from the language of the Constitution, from the nature and principles of our Government, from the theory of republican liberty itself, from the unvaried practice, evidencing the universal belief of all, in all periods and of all parties and opinions. They think, too, that, as the general rule, the representatives of the people, sitting in their legislative capacity, with open doors, under the eye of the country, communicating freely with their constituents, may exercise this power more intelligently, more discreetly, may acquire more accurate and more minute information concerning the employments and the interests on which this description of measures will press, and may better discern what true policy prescribes and rejects, than is within the competence of the executive department of the Government.

Upon this single ground, then, the committee advise that the treaty be rejected.

Now, I hold in my hand a work by Mr. Charles Henry Butler on the treaty-making power of the United States, in which he quotes from an eminent German authority, an authority who, as is stated here, has given to the subject a degree of elaborate and extended exposition which it has received from no writer in our own tongue. I can not pause long enough to quote in full the comment of the writer on this subject, but I commend it to you. It is by Doctor Meier, professor in the university at Leipzig, and it shows in effect that if the treaty-making power has the legislative power contended for in some quarters we have here as ideal an oligarchy as was ever established.

To my mind it is not conceivable that the framers of the Constitution should elaborately construct through many pages of that instrument a legislative machine, should carefully define and limit its powers, and then in two lines with reference to composing differences with foreign states it should throw all that machinery out of gear and construct another legislative machine superior to it.

The Senate is not constituted upon the popular principle; it represents the States as sovereignties. They have equal representation without regard to population. One man in one State has one hundred times the voice in choosing it that one man has in another State. In the House, on the other hand, the Members represent substantially equal populations. This nation was based on the proposition that those who paid the taxes should say, speaking through their Representatives, what taxes should be imposed. And unless the framers of the Constitution were greatly mistaken, unless the great contemporary expounders, Madison and Hamilton, were mistaken, unless the blazing lesson of our Revolution was lost upon the men who established it in war, the Constitution conferred upon the House a real power and not the shadow when it gave it the right to originate revenue bills.

Now, I wish to call the attention of the House for a few moments to the effect of this measure; but I will say in leaving the subject of the Senate, which the gentleman from Mississippi has introduced, that the Senate is made up in the main of very eminent men. Most of them derive their lineage from the House of Representatives. They would make a virtuous oligarchy, I doubt not; but I do not believe that the American people are yet prepared to have it written, as the preamble to their laws, "Be it enacted by the Senate of the United States in executive session assembled." [Laughter and applause on the Republican side.]

This bill proceeds upon the theory that there should be reciprocity between this country and Cuba, and I think "reciprocity" is a word that no gentleman on either side of the House can properly take offense at. I believe that the first reciprocity treaty was negotiated by Richard Cobden, and that the greatest advocate of reciprocity in our time was William McKinley. The name of one is a synonym for free trade, and the name of the other is a synonym for protection.

Reciprocity goes upon the theory that there are oftentimes, in the relations of two people, conditions that make it peculiarly proper that they shall have reciprocal trade arrangements with each other. The position of Cuba, her political relations to this country, the fact that American interests predominate there, the fact that we buy nearly all she has to sell, and sell her a great portion of what she buys, make her case, it seems to me, as strong a one as could be imagined for the application of the principle of reciprocity.

With reference to the fiscal features of the bill, the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means has pointed out that the decrease in revenue will be about \$6,000,000 a year, but that a

sufficient revenue will still be left with which to run our own Government. A deficit is a governmental institution which I think it is well to avoid, but there is a grave distinction between mere narrowness of revenue, which is the keenest spur to the economical expenditure of public money, and that great and yawning chasm between income and outcome which we witnessed ten years ago, in which the public credit itself was engulfed. But even from that standpoint of revenue it is clear that while at the beginning we shall lose some \$6,000,000 a year, the probability is that within the five years of this convention or sooner than that we shall have at least 20 per cent increase in the imports from Cuba, and that will place our revenue upon Cuban products where it is to-day.

Now, with reference to the peculiar trade relations of this country and Cuba. During the last fiscal year we took of Cuba's total exports some 77 per cent, and we sold to her about 42 per cent of what she bought from the rest of the world. This was taking a larger proportion from her of what she sold than she took from us of her purchases, and the treaty recognizes this fact, for while it levies a uniform reduction of 20 per cent upon Cuban products coming into our markets, it gives our products going to Cuba a reduction of from 20 per cent to 40 per cent.

The details of the Cuban trade which have been brought to the attention of the committee by my colleagues show the evidence upon which we may expect a great gain to our own commerce. There were, for instance, under the head of alimentary articles—articles of food and drink—brought from the United States into Cuba about \$3,700,000 worth per year, and from other countries about \$13,000,000 per year. These articles are largely the product of our agriculture and of our fisheries, and under the duties which are prescribed by this bill the United States will almost inevitably get all this trade. Then there is another item of wearing apparel, of boots and shoes, and cotton, and similar articles, of which the United States last year sold to Cuba \$1,127,000 worth, while Cuba bought from the rest of the world \$10,186,000 worth. This item will almost certainly appear in the trade of the United States. And then in cattle—Cuba imported from the United States cattle to the value of \$3,347,000, and from the rest of the world \$6,772,000. Here is an opportunity for a further expansion of trade in a product of our farms.

The effect upon the beet-sugar industry has caused alarm, and very naturally so, to those Representatives in this House that come from States largely interested in the manufacture of beet sugar. I do not think it is in a particle of danger. Suppose that the reduction proposed by this bill to 1.35 cents a pound upon raw sugar should measure the entire protection that would exist upon sugar after the passage of this bill—and I feel confident that it will not—I think it is susceptible of demonstration that the protection will be substantially what it is at the present time. But suppose that the amount of 1.35 cents will measure the full amount of protection. It seems to me that the beet-sugar industry would be entirely safe even with that amount of protection. In the testimony taken before the Committee on Ways and Means two years ago our collector at Habana, Mr. Bliss, testified that he had examined the returns from eight different plantations and he found the average cost of making sugar there and of taking it to the port of shipment was 2½ cents. Mr. Atkins, who is a successful business man and a sugar manufacturer, reached substantially the same conclusion.

All the evidence that could be called evidence went to show that it cost the Cuban at least 2 cents a pound to make his raw sugar. Now, if to that you add this 1.35, and if to that you add the freight rate and the insurance and other charges, he can not afford to sell his sugar in the New York market for less than three and about seven-eighths of a cent a pound, and it must after that be refined, so that a price would be reached at which it would clearly be profitable to make refined sugar here.

Mr. Oxnard, who has been as much identified with the manufacture of beet sugar as any man in the United States, put forth a statement after he had been engaged in that business nine years to the effect that at 4 cents a pound and allowing the farmer \$4 per ton for his beets there was then a profit of about 43 per cent upon the cost of the material and labor employed, and that in selling the refined product at 4 cents a pound. Not a small profit by any means. As a matter of fact he would get nearer 5 than 4 cents a pound. Is it not, therefore, clear that under this duty of 1.35 per pound, which is a specific duty equivalent to an ad valorem duty of nearly 80 per cent including the freight, our beet-sugar producers have nothing whatever to fear?

But I have been acting upon the assumption that the total protection afforded the beet-sugar grower would be the duty as against Cuban sugar under this bill. It seems to me there is no doubt that during the five years that this convention is to last the protection will be substantially that afforded by existing law. I arrived at that conclusion in this way: At present we make in the United States and in Hawaii and Porto Rico about 900,000

tons of sugar each year. We consume about 2,600,000 tons. This leaves an enormous deficit that must be supplied from the markets of the world. Even if we take the entire production of Cuba at the greatest amount it has ever reached, at about 1,000,000 tons, we still have a great deficit of six or seven hundred thousand tons.

That we must bring in from abroad and must pay for in the world's price, which is fixed at Hamburg. The price, then, in New York will be the Hamburg price, plus the freight and plus the full duty. Now, Cuban sugar in New York will sell precisely on a parity with Hamburg sugar, grade for grade. The sugar refiner will not buy Hamburg sugar when there is a cargo of Cuban sugar beside it that would be sold for a particle less. They will both bring the same price. The result, therefore, is that the Cuban sugar will get the full Hamburg price, plus the Hamburg freight, plus the full duty. In other words, the Cuban planter will get the advantage of the difference between our duty as against Hamburg sugar and our duty as against Cuban sugar. Now, this will be a very important matter to him, and it will be a matter of little consequence to us.

I think, therefore, that these conclusions are very clear from the situation, first, that the reduction of duty will not materially affect prices here and will go to the Cuban planter; second, that the reduction will gradually result in an increase of exports from Cuba to the United States and from the United States to Cuba; and third, that the United States sugar producers will be unaffected. I should perhaps slightly qualify this last statement. There will perhaps be a gradual lowering of the price. If the effect of this bill shall be an increased production of sugar in Cuba, as I think it will, then there will be the amount of that increase added to the world's supply of sugar, and to that extent there will be a lowering of the world's price; but that will be a slow process and an almost imperceptible one, and our beet-sugar manufacturers will be substantially unaffected until the production from Cuba shall reach that point where, combined with the production of the United States, it will be substantially enough to meet the consumption of the United States.

Mr. WM. ALDEN SMITH. Is the gentleman unwilling to admit that if Cuba progresses as she has in the past few years she may reach that point before this convention expires?

Mr. McCALL. Mr. Chairman, I think there is very little likelihood that that will occur. In the first place, we had a convention with Cuba under the terms of the McKinley Act. That treaty was in effect for three years. At that time Cuba had free sugar, and yet the total net result of the operation of that convention was that for three years the sugar production of Cuba increased only to the extent of about 200,000 tons.

Mr. WM. ALDEN SMITH. But we were producing no beet sugar at that time.

Mr. McCALL. That may be, but beet sugar is merely a drop in the bucket in our consumption.

Mr. WM. ALDEN SMITH. Oh, no.

Mr. McCALL. While the great bulk of the sugar consumed in this country comes from the world outside, Cuba had free access to our markets, and yet she only increased her production 200,000 tons in three years.

Then again I will say to the gentleman that Cuba is interested in other industries. Tobacco is a most important industry in Cuba. She can not take all of her population and set them to raising sugar. She has a limited population and a limited supply of labor, and it is very unlikely that there should be such a sudden increase in production as the gentleman fears.

I have, perhaps, said more than is necessary concerning the financial features of this measure in view of the clear sentiment of the House upon the bill. I wish to say a word about those weightier considerations of a high political and moral character that are based not upon mere expediency, but that grow out of the demands of justice. An individual man, strong and rich, may not with impunity oppress another who is weak and poor, because he is held in terror by the law. But what court is there which could enter and enforce a decree against the United States in favor of Cuba? Her case therefore calls for the exercise of that higher and more difficult, because merely voluntary, justice which a strong nation measures out to a weak one.

Cuba is not strong enough physically to enforce any claim against the United States. She has no army or navy. She is just entering upon her career as a nation. She is absolutely in the hollow of our hands, so that whatever we do for her will not be done by us out of fear, but will come about by the operation upon our will of the abstract principles of justice. Cuba has already done something at our dictation. She has surrendered to us important naval stations upon her southern coast, and surrendered them at our demand. She has also imposed very serious limitations upon her power to treat with other nations, and she has done this upon our demand.

We have put Cuba in a position where she can safely make no

trade compact with any other nation than ourselves. We have resting upon us the obligations of a mother to a daughter. Her government has been reared upon soil soaked by the blood of our soldiers, and it exists because of the battles that have been fought by Americans upon her territory and upon the seas that surround her and on the other side of the world. She guards the approach to the isthmian canal and the mouths of the Mississippi. Her peace and happiness are most important to us. Her prosperity will conduce to our repose as well as our renown, and the Members of this House have an opportunity to-day to add appreciably to the glory and to serve the honor of their country by voting for this bill with substantial unanimity. [Loud applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Chairman, I suppose that under the rule, general debate being closed, the committee will rise.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman not desire to occupy any more of his time?

Mr. PAYNE. I do not.

The CHAIRMAN. The committee will now rise.

The committee accordingly rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. SHERMAN, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that, under the rule of the House adopted on Monday, the House had been in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union considering the bill H. R. 1921, and in pursuance of the rule the committee had risen, and on its behalf he reported the bill back to the House.

The SPEAKER. In accordance with the special order made by the House, the question recurs on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman rise?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. I desire to be recognized for the purpose of moving to recommit with the following instructions. I ask that the motion be read.

The SPEAKER. One moment.

Mr. PAYNE. I make the point of order, Mr. Speaker, that that motion is not in order under the rule.

The SPEAKER. It is not now, and would not be in order now if the rules were in force.

Mr. PAYNE. It would not be in order at any time under this resolution.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Then I ask to be recognized at the proper time, immediately after the third reading of the bill, for the purpose of offering the motion.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time; and it was accordingly read the third time.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I now ask to be recognized for the purpose of offering a motion, which I send to the Clerk's desk, to recommit with certain instructions.

Mr. PAYNE. To that, Mr. Speaker, I make a point of order.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. I ask unanimous consent that the Clerk may read the motion before the Chair rules, for the information of the House.

Mr. PAYNE. We have had that amendment read galore, and I object to it.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. The reading of the amendment will not hurt you.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Mississippi states that he desires to move to recommit the bill, with certain instructions, to the Committee on Ways and Means. That fact is sufficient to notify the House and the Chair of the desire of the gentleman from Mississippi, and the gentleman from New York makes the point of order that a motion to recommit is not in order under the special order adopted by the House. The Clerk will read the special order under which the House is now proceeding.

The Clerk read as follows:

The Committee on Rules, to whom was referred the resolution of the House numbered 17, have had the same under consideration, and ask leave to report in lieu thereof the following:

"Resolved, That immediately on the adoption of this rule, and immediately after the reading of the Journal on each day thereafter until the bill herein-after mentioned shall have been disposed of, the House shall resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill H. R. 1921, a bill to carry into effect a convention between the United States and the Republic of Cuba, signed on the 11th day of December, 1902; that not later than 4 o'clock on November 19 general debate shall be closed in Committee of the Whole, and whenever general debate is closed the committee shall rise and report the bill to the House; and immediately the House shall vote without debate or intervening motion on the engrossment and third reading and on the passage of the bill."

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Now, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the motion be read for the information of the House.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman asks unanimous consent that the motion be read for the information of the House.

Mr. PAYNE. I would like to ask the gentleman from Mississippi if this is the same motion which he read in Committee of the Whole and is now a part of the record?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. The House will not know until after it is read.

Mr. PAYNE. It is the same amendment that the gentleman read in Committee of the Whole?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. It is the same amendment.

Mr. PAYNE. Then I object, because it has already been read.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Do I understand that the Chair has ruled the amendment out of order?

The SPEAKER. The Chair is about to rule.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. I was merely anticipating the well-known tendencies of the Chair. [Laughter.]

The SPEAKER. The special order under which the House is proceeding has just been read, and that order provides that without intervening motion the House will vote on the engrossment and third reading of the bill. The House has voted, and the bill has been read for the third time. And it also provides that without intervening motion the House will vote upon the passage of the bill. Under the rules of the House ordinarily, without a special order, the gentleman's motion at this stage of the proceeding would be in order, but this order changes the rule and cuts the gentleman's motion off by prior action of the House. Therefore, the Chair holds that the gentleman's motion is not in order.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, would it be in order to discuss the ruling of the Chair? Does the Chair wish to hear me upon that point? Then I shall take an appeal from the decision of the Chair, and I would like to make a few remarks upon that.

Mr. PAYNE. I make the point of order, Mr. Speaker, that it is dilatory, and that under the rule that has been adopted by the House it can not be entertained.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Well, Mr. Speaker, I want to discuss that point of order which the gentleman from New York has just made.

Mr. PAYNE. Then I make the further point of order to that discussion under the rules.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. The gentleman from New York can not make the point of order that this is dilatory, because as a matter of fact it is not dilatory, and I have the floor.

Mr. PAYNE. I can make the point of order if the gentleman has the floor.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to discuss the point of order.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, debate is never in order except for the benefit of the Chair.

The SPEAKER. The Chair has the privilege of hearing the gentleman upon the point of order.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Undoubtedly; and I only want about five minutes.

The SPEAKER. If the present occupant of the chair understands the rule, it is entirely within the province of the Chair to hear the gentleman upon the point of order; and the Chair, desiring to be entirely courteous to the gentleman from Mississippi, will listen to what he has to say upon the point of order.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. It is an old adage, Mr. Speaker, that a subject is always grateful to Caesar for special indulgences. [Laughter.] In order to show that this motion is not dilatory, I want to call the attention of the Speaker to the fact that it has been the persistent effort of the minority upon this side to obtain a vote upon this motion. Whatever other point of order may be made against it, and some other point of order might possibly be sustained, the point of order that this is dilatory can not be sustained. My object in offering this resolution is not to delay, and the word "dilatory" means delay; but it is to let the country and the people who control us all understand the nature of the amendment which we offer and would like to get a vote upon from the House if we can.

Whatever objection may be made to it, therefore, it is not offered for purposes of delay. It is offered in good faith and sincerely for the consideration of the House, and in order to prove that, Mr. Speaker, I will not read the resolution.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will please suspend for a moment. The Chair will hear from the gentleman from New York, who desires to be heard briefly on this point.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, allow me to conclude my remarks and I will be through in a sentence. I think it is important to the Chair's consideration of the question as to whether this is dilatory or not to read the motion.

The SPEAKER. The Chair has fairly indicated that he desires to hear from the other side upon this point of order.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I made the point of order, first, that it is dilatory. The late Speaker Crisp held time and again that a motion was dilatory when it delayed action, no matter what the intention of the mover was, whether he made it as a dilatory

motion with a desire to delay business or not. The House has decided to vote first upon the engrossment and third reading of this bill, and then, without intervening motion, to vote upon the passage of the bill—without intervening motion or debate, to vote upon the passage of the bill.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. The word "debate" is not in the rule.

Mr. PAYNE. Now, this amendment offered is certainly an intervening motion. I made the point of order that the amendment was not in order because obnoxious to the special rule of the House, and the Chair sustained that motion. We are here waiting under the rule for the final vote upon this bill. Whatever motion the gentleman makes under any of the general rules of the House which delays a vote upon this bill for a single moment is delay and should be ruled out as a motion causing delay, a motion that delays the action upon the bill. But, further than that, Mr. Speaker, the House decided by a fair majority on Monday last that this vote should be without any intervening motion, and here we have an appeal to the House. It is an intervening motion, so that upon every ground—upon the ground of delay or upon the ground that it is an intervening motion—it is clearly out of order.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER. The Chair is prepared to rule.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Before the Chair rules—

The SPEAKER. The Chair does not desire to hear the gentleman.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. One reply to the gentleman from New York—

The SPEAKER. It needs no reply. [Laughter.]

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. I think so myself.

The SPEAKER. The Chair is prepared to rule. The Clerk will read section 3 of Rule XVII.

The Clerk read as follows:

All incidental questions of order arising after a motion is made to the previous question, and pending such motion, shall be decided, whether on appeal or otherwise, without debate.

The SPEAKER. If, under the rules, the previous question has been moved upon the question arising, there are many precedents where points of order would be entertained, and, of course, if entertained, be subject to appeal, unless they be dilatory, when they would come under another rule. Now, the House, after debate, has adopted this special order upon a yea-and-nay vote with a full House, and we are proceeding under the special order, which cuts off a motion to recommit, which motion would otherwise be in order. When the gentleman seeks to make the motion to recommit, the Chair necessarily, under the order of the House, sustains the point of order to that motion. The gentleman appeals from the ruling of the Chair. The Chair thinks the better practice is not to invoke the rule touching dilatory motions except in cases where the purpose to delay is plainly evident, and the Chair would prefer to err, if it errs at all, upon giving the House the right to express its will; and although the House may have expressed its will otherwise heretofore, the Chair is proceeding under the order of the House in making the ruling, from which ruling the gentleman from Mississippi appeals. The Chair therefore entertains the appeal. [Applause on Democratic side.]

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I move to lay the appeal on the table.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from New York, who moves to lay the appeal on the table.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, in order to save time I think we might as well have the yeas and nays upon the motion to lay the appeal on the table, and I demand them.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 194, nays 165, answered present 2, not voting 22, as follows:

YEAS—194.

Acheson,	Burkett,	Douglas,	Hamilton,
Adams, Pa.	Burleigh,	Dovener,	Haskins,
Adams, Wis.	Burton,	Draper,	Haugen,
Alexander,	Butler, Pa.	Dresser,	Hedge,
Allen,	Calderhead,	Driscoll,	Hemenway,
Ames,	Campbell,	Dunwell,	Henry, Conn.
Babcock,	Capron,	Dwight,	Hepburn,
Bartholdt,	Cassel,	Esch,	Hermann,
Bates,	Conner,	Evans,	Hildebrandt,
Bede,	Cooper, Pa.	Fordney,	Hill, Conn.
Beidler,	Cooper, Wis.	Foss,	Hinsaw,
Bingham,	Cousins,	Foster, Vt.	Hitt,
Birdsall,	Cromer,	Fowler,	Hogg,
Bishop,	Crumpacker,	French,	Holliday,
Boutell,	Currier,	Fuller,	Howell, N. J.
Bowersock,	Curtis,	Gaines, W. Va.	Howell, Utah
Brandegge,	Dalzell,	Gardner, Mass.	Huff,
Bradley,	Daniels,	Gardner, Mich.	Hughes, W. Va.
Brick,	Darragh,	Gardner, N. J.	Hull,
Brooks,	Davidson,	Gibson,	Humphrey, Wash.
Brown, Pa.	Davis, Minn.	Gillet, N. Y.	Jackson, Md.
Brown, Wis.	Dayton,	Gillett, Cal.	Jackson, Ohio
Brownlow,	Deemer,	Gillett, Mass.	Jenkins,
Buckman,	Dick,	Graff,	Jones, Wash.
Burke, S. Dak.	Dixon,	Greene,	Kennedy,

Ketcham,	Mann,	Powers, Me.	Stevens, Minn.
Kinkaid,	Marsh,	Prince,	Sulloway,
Knapp,	Marshall,	Reeder,	Tawney,
Knopf,	Martin,	Roberts,	Thomas, Iowa
Kyle,	Metcalf,	Rodenberg,	Tirrell,
Lacey,	Miller,	Scott,	Townsend,
Lafean,	Minor,	Sherman,	Van Voorhis,
Landis, Chas. B.	Mondell,	Shiras,	Volstead,
Landis, Frederick	Moon, Pa.	Sibley,	Vreeland,
Lanning,	Morgan,	Skiles,	Wachter,
Lawrence,	Morrell,	Slemp,	Wadsworth,
Lilley,	Murdock,	Smith, Ill.	Wanger,
Longworth,	Needham,	Smith, Iowa	Warner,
Lorimer,	Norris,	Smith, Samuel W.	Warnock,
Loud,	Olmsted,	Smith, Wm. Alden	Watson,
Loudenslager,	Otis,	Smith, Pa.	Weems,
Lovering,	Otjen,	Snapp,	Wiley, N. J.
McCall,	Overstreet,	Southard,	Williamson,
McCarthy,	Parker,	Southwick,	Wilson, Ill.
McCleary, Minn.	Patterson, Pa.	Spalding,	Woodyard,
McCreary, Pa.	Payne,	Sperry,	Wright,
McLachlan,	Pearre,	Stafford,	Young,
McMorran,	Perkins,	Steenerson,	
Mahon,	Porter,	Sterling,	

NAYS—165.

Adamson,	Foster, Ill.	Lewis,	Shackleford,
Aiken,	Gaines, Tenn.	Lind,	Shafroth,
Badger,	Garber,	Lindsay,	Sheppard,
Baker,	Garner,	Little,	Sherley,
Bankhead,	Gilbert,	Livernash,	Shober,
Bartlett,	Gillespie,	Livingston,	Shull,
Bassett,	Glass,	Lloyd,	Sims,
Beall, Tex.	Goldfogle,	Lucking,	Slayden,
Bell, Cal.	Gooch,	McAndrews,	Smith, Ky.
Benny,	Goulden,	McClellan,	Smith, Tex.
Benton,	Granger,	McLain,	Snook,
Bowers,	Gregg,	McNary,	Southall,
Bowie,	Griffith,	Macon,	Sparkman,
Brantley,	Griggs,	Maddox,	Spight,
Breazeale,	Gudger,	Mahoney,	Stanley,
Broussard,	Hamlin,	Maynard,	Stephens, Tex.
Brundidge,	Hardwick,	Meyer, La.	Sullivan, Mass.
Burgess,	Harrison,	Moon, Tenn.	Sullivan, N. Y.
Burleson,	Hay,	Padgett,	Sulzer,
Burnett,	Henry, Tex.	Page,	Swanson,
Butler, Mo.	Hill, Miss.	Patterson, N. C.	Talbot,
Caldwell,	Hitchcock,	Patterson, Tenn.	Tate,
Candler,	Hopkins,	Pierce,	Taylor,
Cassingham,	Houston,	Pou,	Thayer,
Clayton,	Howard,	Pujo,	Thomas, N. C.
Cochran,	Howell, Pa.	Rainey,	Thompson,
Cowherd,	Hughes, N. J.	Randell, Tex.	Trimble,
Croft,	Humphreys, Miss.	Ransdell, La.	Underwood,
Crowley,	Hunt,	Reid,	Vandiver,
Davey, La.	James,	Rhea,	Van Duzer,
Davis, Fla.	Johnson,	Rider,	Wade,
De Armond,	Jones, Va.	Rixey,	Wallace,
Denny,	Kehoe,	Robb,	Webb,
Dickerman,	Kelher,	Robertson, La.	Wiley, Ala.
Dinsmore,	Kline,	Robinson, Ark.	Williams, Ill.
Dougherty,	Klutz,	Robinson, Ind.	Williams, Miss.
Emerich,	Lamar, Fla.	Rucker,	Wilson, N. Y.
Field,	Lamar, Mo.	Ruppert,	Wynn,
Finley,	Lamb,	Russell,	Zenor.
Fitzgerald,	Legare,	Ryan,	
Fitzpatrick,	Lester,	Scarborough,	
Flood,	Lever,	Scudder,	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—2.

Miers, Ind. Small.

NOT VOTING—22.

Burk, Pa.	Goebel,	Richardson, Ala.
Byrd,	Grosvenor,	Richardson, Tenn.
Clark,	Hearst,	Smith, N. Y.
Cooper, Tex.	Kitchin, Claude	Weisse.
Cushman,	Kitchin, Wm. W.	
Flack,	Littauer,	

So the appeal was laid on the table.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Until further notice:

Mr. GROSVENOR with Mr. CLARK.

For the special session:

Mr. LITTLEFIELD with Mr. SMALL.

For one week:

Mr. MUDD with Mr. WILLIAM W. KITCHIN.

Until Saturday next:

Mr. BURK of Pennsylvania with Mr. BYRD.

For this day:

Mr. LITTAUER with Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee.

Mr. FLACK with Mr. RICHARDSON of Alabama.

Mr. CUSHMAN with Mr. COOPER of Texas.

Mr. NEVIN with Mr. WEISSE.

Mr. POWERS of Massachusetts with Mr. McDERMOTT.

Mr. PALMER with Mr. CLAUDE KITCHIN.

Mr. GOEBEL with Mr. MIERS of Indiana.

Mr. MIERS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I am paired with the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GOEBEL]. I voted "no." I desire to withdraw my vote and to be marked "present."

Mr. SMALL. Mr. Speaker, I voted "no;" but I am paired with the gentleman from Maine [Mr. LITTLEFIELD] and I desire to withdraw my vote and be recorded "present."

Mr. SLAYDEN. Mr. Speaker, I was requested by my colleague [Mr. COOPER of Texas] to state that he was unexpectedly and unavoidably detained by business, and he asks to be excused.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I wish to state that my colleague [Mr. BYRD] is absent at home on account of sickness in his family.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Mississippi will agree with the Chair that these statements are not in order under the rule.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. I had not thought of that.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The question now recurs upon the passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and the Speaker announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. FORDNEY. I demand the yeas and nays.

The question was taken on ordering the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER. Twenty-three gentlemen have arisen, not a sufficient number, and the yeas and nays are refused.

Mr. WM. ALDEN SMITH. I call for a division.

Mr. PAYNE. It is too late. [Cries of "Too late!"]

The SPEAKER. Was the gentleman on his feet for the purpose of asking for a division and seeking to be recognized?

Mr. WM. ALDEN SMITH. I was.

The question was taken; and the House divided, when there were—ayes 335, noes 21.

So the bill was passed. [Loud applause.]

On motion of Mr. PAYNE, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS.

Mr. PAYNE. I ask unanimous consent that all who have spoken in the debate on the bill be allowed to extend their remarks in the RECORD within the next five days.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent that all who have spoken on the bill may have leave to extend their remarks in the RECORD for the next five days. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

ADJOURNMENT OVER.

Mr. PAYNE. On consultation with several Members it would seem more convenient, I think, if we should adjourn from to-day until to-morrow, and then to-morrow adjourn until Tuesday next. It will be impossible to transact any business until the committees are announced, and I would like to have unanimous consent now that when the House adjourn to-morrow it be to meet on Tuesday next.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent that when the House adjourn to-morrow it adjourn to meet on Tuesday next. Is there objection?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. I will be forced to object.

Mr. PAYNE. I asked unanimous consent to make a motion to that effect now.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. I shall not object to that.

Mr. PAYNE. I ask unanimous consent to make that motion.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. PAYNE. Now, I move that when the House adjourn to-morrow it adjourn to meet on Tuesday next.

The question was taken, and the motion was agreed to.

REPRINT OF BILL.

Mr. SULZER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for a reprint of House bill 34, introduced by me.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent for a reprint of House bill 34. Is there objection?

Mr. PAYNE. Let us hear the title.

Mr. SULZER. It is entitled "A bill to regulate commerce with foreign nations, to make preference in the use of American vessels in the postal service at sea, and to promote American commerce." The supply is exhausted.

Mr. PAYNE. I think I shall have to object to that, Mr. Speaker. There is too much of it. [Laughter.] I move that the House do now adjourn.

ADDITIONAL LABORER IN BATHROOM.

Mr. HILDEBRANT. Mr. Speaker, I present a privileged resolution.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Ohio, from the Committee on Accounts, presents a privileged report.

Mr. HILDEBRANT. It is not a report from the Committee on Accounts. It is a privileged resolution.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Ohio presents a privileged resolution, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the Clerk of the House is hereby authorized and directed to employ an additional laborer in the bathroom during the remainder of the present fiscal year, to be paid out of the contingent fund of the House at the rate of \$60 per month.

Mr. PAYNE. It distresses me very much to make the point of order against that resolution.

The SPEAKER. Perhaps the matter can be adjusted.

Mr. HILDEBRANDT. It tends to the organization of the House.

The SPEAKER. It may tend to its comfort. [Laughter.] The gentleman from Ohio asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of the resolution. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The question was taken; and the resolution was agreed to.

Mr. PAYNE. I renew the motion to adjourn.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

By unanimous consent, Mr. WILEY obtained leave of absence for ten days, on account of important business.

Mr. PAYNE. I renew my motion to adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 38 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATION.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, the following executive communication was taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, with a favorable recommendation, a draft of a bill to control grazing in forest reserves—to the Committee on the Public Lands, and ordered to be printed.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXII, the Committee on Claims was discharged from the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3456) for the relief of W. W. Jackson; and the same was referred to the Committee on War Claims.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials of the following titles were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. GAINES of Tennessee: A bill (H. R. 4482) for the relief of tobacco growers—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MANN: A bill (H. R. 4483) declaring the tunnels under the Chicago River an obstruction to navigation, and for other purposes—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BADGER: A bill (H. R. 4484) appropriating the use of certain old Springfield breech-loading rifles to the old guard and Grand Army of the Republic drill corps, in the various States of the Union—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MADDOX: A bill (H. R. 4485) to construct a road from the army post at Chickamauga National Park, Georgia, to the rifle range and military range at or near Waco, Ga.—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SULLOWAY: A bill (H. R. 4486) for the erection of an equestrian statue of Maj. Gen. John Stark in the city of Manchester, N. H.—to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. DANIELS: A bill (H. R. 4487) for the construction of a free public trail from the eastern slope of the Sierra Nevada Mountains, in Inyo County, Cal., to the summit of Mount Whitney, California—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi: A bill (H. R. 4488) to reduce import duties on articles the growth and products of certain countries—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ESCH: A bill (H. R. 4489) to amend section 64 of the bankruptcy act—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PEARRE: A bill (H. R. 4490) to establish a fish hatchery and fish station in the State of Maryland—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4491) to establish a permanent military camp ground in the vicinity of Oakland, in Garrett County, Md.—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. ALLEN: A bill (H. R. 4492) to provide for the erection of a public building at Portland, in the State of Maine—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. PEARRE: A bill (H. R. 4493) to provide for a macadamized roadway from the town of Sharpsburg, Md., to the Connecticut monument on the battlefield of Antietam—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4494) to provide for the erection of a monument to the heroes of the war of the American Revolution—to the Committee on the Library.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4495) to establish a national military park at Fort Frederick, Md.—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4496) to amend an act entitled "An act to extend the free-delivery system of the Post-Office Department, and for other purposes," approved January 3, 1887—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. RODEY: A bill (H. R. 4497) to amend the laws relating to the issuance of bonds by municipalities in Territories so as to include the issuance of the same for gas and electric lighting purposes—to the Committee on the Territories.

By Mr. McLAIN: A bill (H. R. 4498) for the protection and

improvement of harbor on Mississippi River at Natchez, Miss.—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. SPARKMAN: A bill (H. R. 4499) to provide for the construction of a revenue cutter of the first class for service in the waters of Key West, Fla.—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4500) authorizing, empowering, and directing the Commissioner of Fish and Fisheries to establish in the State of Florida, on the Gulf of Mexico, a station for the investigation of problems connected with the marine-fishery interests of the region—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4501) in relation to claims arising under the provisions of the captured and abandoned property acts, and for other purposes, and to amend and revive the same—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. LAMAR of Florida: A bill (H. R. 4502) to grant land to the State of Florida for the use of the normal college for white pupils at De Funiak Springs and for the use of the normal college at Tallahassee for colored pupils—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. WILEY of Alabama: A bill (H. R. 4503) in relation to the expense of holding courts of the United States in the northern and middle districts of Alabama—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DOVENER: A bill (H. R. 4504) for the benefit of officers who served over three years during the civil war and over thirty years since, and who have retired on account of disability incurred in the line of duty since the close of the Spanish-American war—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. FOSTER of Vermont: A bill (H. R. 4505) to make \$10 per month the minimum amount of pensions paid by the Government—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RAINEY: A bill (H. R. 4506) providing for excavating a new channel for Fox Creek and for dredging the bar formed by Fox Creek in Hamburg Bay, Calhoun County, Ill.—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. MORRELL: A bill (H. R. 4507) to prevent discrimination by common carriers of passengers traveling between the States on account of race and color—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BROWNLOW: A bill (H. R. 4508) to create in the Department of Agriculture a bureau to be known as the Bureau of Public Roads, and to provide for a system of national, State, and local cooperation in the permanent improvement of the public highways—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. LAMAR of Florida: A bill (H. R. 4509) making an appropriation for completing the improvement of the road to the national cemetery near Pensacola, Fla.—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MIERS of Indiana: A bill (H. R. 4510) to provide for the Theater of National Education—to the Committee on Education.

By Mr. RYAN: A bill (H. R. 4511) to prevent fraud in the sale of boots, shoes, slippers, or other leather footwear—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. DICKERMAN: A bill (H. R. 4512) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at Shamokin, in the State of Pennsylvania—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. JENKINS: A bill (H. R. 4513) to amend the act entitled "An act to better define and regulate the rights of aliens to hold and own real estate in the Territories," approved March 2, 1897—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. BISHOP: A bill (H. R. 4514) to provide for a naval training station for the Great Lakes at Muskegon, Mich.—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. FOSS: A bill (H. R. 4515) to prevent the desecration of the American flag—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CLAYTON: A bill (H. R. 4516) for the maintenance and improvement of the Choctawhatchee River—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. MARTIN: A bill (H. R. 4517) to regulate the use of grazing lands surrounding public reservoir sites upon the public lands of the United States—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. RIXEY: A bill (H. R. 4518) to make Alexandria, Va., a port of entry—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MONDELL: A bill (H. R. 4519) to establish a fish-hatching and fish station in the State of Wyoming—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. SLEMP: A bill (H. R. 4520) to provide for the erection of a public building at Wytheville, Va.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. WILSON of Arizona: A bill (H. R. 4521) to establish a supreme court for the Territories of Arizona, New Mexico, and Oklahoma—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4522) to provide for the payment of claims for losses by old pioneers in the Territory of Arizona during the

years 1862 and 1863 by Indian depredations committed upon these pioneers while holding the mountain passes and trails for immigrants after they were abandoned by the soldiers of the United States Army—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. BURTON: A bill (H. R. 4523) for the purchase or construction of a steel steam light-vessel, to be located on Martins Reef, Michigan—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. RAINEY: A joint resolution (H. J. Res. 42) providing for the removal of the remains of Commodore John Paul Jones from France to the United States—to the Committee on the Library.

Also, a joint resolution (H. J. Res. 43) to remove from the Illinois River the Government dams at Kampsville and Lagrange—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SPARKMAN: A joint resolution (H. J. Res. 44) for relief of P. J. McMahon—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi: A resolution (H. Res. 24) looking toward reconvening the Joint High Commission appointed by Great Britain, the Dominion of Canada, and the United States for the purpose of agreeing upon freer trade relations—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. RAINEY: A resolution (H. Res. 25) asking for estimate as to cost of certain improvements in Hamburg Bay, Calhoun County, Ill.—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, a resolution (H. Res. 26) requesting information as to flow of water into Illinois River through Chicago Drainage Canal, and estimate as to cost of surveying Government dams, etc.—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BARTLETT: A bill (H. R. 4524) for the relief of the estate of Samuel M. Farrar, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4525) for the relief of the estate of Daniel Brewer, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. BOWERSOCK: A bill (H. R. 4526) granting an increase of pension to William J. Shepherd—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4527) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth Siples—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4528) granting an increase of pension to Charles S. Atkins—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4529) granting a pension to William Deay—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4530) granting a pension to Dr. J. A. Cook—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4531) granting a pension to Martha R. Divibiss—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4532) granting a pension to John F. Epler—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4533) granting a pension to Marquis L. Kennedy—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4534) granting an honorable discharge to Marion M. Barton—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4535) for the relief of Harriet Camp—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. BRADLEY: A bill (H. R. 4536) for the relief of Nancy Rose—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. CALDWELL: A bill (H. R. 4537) for the relief of Charles T. Bouillon for arrears of pension—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CLAYTON: A bill (H. R. 4538) for the relief of Mary F. Casey Tucker—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4539) granting a pension to Jane E. Tatum—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4540) granting a pension to Amanda Skinner—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DANIELS: A bill (H. R. 4541) for the relief of Mrs. Louise E. Ord—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota: A bill (H. R. 4542) granting a pension to Elizabeth M. Vandiver—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DICK: A bill (H. R. 4543) for the relief of John A. Wanless—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4544) for the relief of Harlow L. Street—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4545) for the relief of John W. Lewis—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4546) for the relief of John F. Lewis—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4547) for the relief of Edward Byrne—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4548) to remove charge of desertion against A. B. Ackerman—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4549) to correct the military record of Jacob Eckert—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4550) to remove the charge of desertion and grant an honorable discharge to Richard Lanigan—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4551) granting a pension to Martha J. Hurlbut—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4552) granting an increase of pension to Orin P. Stoffer—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4553) granting an increase of pension to M. Cornelia Harmon—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4554) granting an increase of pension to George A. Breckinridge—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4555) to amend the muster roll of Company B, Ninth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteers, so as to place thereon the name of William C. Armstrong—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4556) granting an increase of pension to Margaret L. Getty—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4557) granting a pension to Sadie C. Steadman—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4558) granting an increase of pension to Almira G. Johnson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4559) granting an increase of pension to Andrew H. Vorderman—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4560) granting an increase of pension to Sarah O. Lyon—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4561) granting an increase of pension to Charles H. Barber—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4562) granting an increase of pension to Perry H. Alexander—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4563) to remove the charge of desertion against Marshall N. Murphy, alias William R. Hallam—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. DICKERMAN: A bill (H. R. 4564) granting a pension to Michael Salter—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4565) granting a pension to Carrie Keefer—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DWIGHT: A bill (H. R. 4566) granting an increase of pension to Stephen N. Leach—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4567) granting an increase of pension to Ezra B. Spoor—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. EVANS: A bill (H. R. 4568) for the relief of John W. Gummo—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. FITZGERALD: A bill (H. R. 4569) for the relief of the heirs of Catharine Gillen—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. FORDNEY: A bill (H. R. 4570) to provide an American register for the steamer *Beaumont*—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. FOSTER of Vermont: A bill (H. R. 4571) granting a pension to John W. Holcomb—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4572) granting a pension to Peter Lander—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4573) for the relief of Eugene Patenaude—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4574) to remove the charge of desertion from the record of John McVar—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4575) to remove the charge of desertion from the record of John Lavigne—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4576) to place Josiah H. Adams on the retired list of the United States Army with the rank of second lieutenant—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. GILBERT: A bill (H. R. 4577) granting a pension to Theodore C. Arons—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GRAFF: A bill (H. R. 4578) granting a pension to Catharine M. McClanahan—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GRANGER: A bill (H. R. 4579) for the relief of the heirs and legal representatives of those killed by the explosion of the gun-cotton factory at the United States torpedo station at Newport, R. I.—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4580) granting a pension to Penelope A. Dexter—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4581) granting an increase of pension to Henry M. Chase—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4582) granting an increase of pension to John S. Miller—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4583) granting a pension to Ella C. Baker—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GREENE: A bill (H. R. 4584) granting an increase of pension to Daniel A. Butler—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HARDWICK: A bill (H. R. 4585) for the relief of W. O. Donovan and the heirs of Lizzie M. Donovan, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. HEPBURN: A bill (H. R. 4586) granting an increase of pension to Elisha Hammer—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HERMANN: A bill (H. R. 4587) granting a pension to Robert Sturgens—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4588) granting a pension to Rollin S. Belknap—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4589) granting a pension to H. H. Barrett—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4590) granting an increase of pension to Daniel Giles—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4591) for the relief of Henry H. Woodward—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4592) for the relief of George D. Elgin—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HOWELL of New Jersey: A bill (H. R. 4593) for the relief of Edgar Zielian—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4594) granting an increase of pension to James Moss—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HUFF: A bill (H. R. 4595) granting an increase of pension to Charles D. Fortney—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HUNT: A bill (H. R. 4596) to correct the military record of Charles W. Howard—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4597) to correct the military record of James H. Campbell—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. JENKINS: A bill (H. R. 4598) granting a pension to James M. Baker—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KINKAID: A bill (H. R. 4599) granting a pension to Ella F. Whitehead—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4600) granting a pension to Jane Sloan—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4601) granting an increase of pension to Hiram S. Kingsley—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4602) granting an increase of pension to Helim Thompson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LAMAR of Missouri: A bill (H. R. 4603) to amend and correct the records of Company D, Seventh Regiment Provisional Enrolled Missouri Militia, by including the name of Valentine Fraker therein, with the dates of his enlistment and discharge—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4604) granting a pension to Christian Kloppe—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4605) granting an increase of pension to William Herlinger—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LAMAR of Florida: A bill (H. R. 4606) for the relief of W. M. Quinn and George L. Long—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4607) for the relief of John Barfield—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4608) for the relief of Capt. J. E. Turtle—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4609) for the relief of the heirs at law of Edward N. Oldmixon—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4610) for the relief of Samuel Puleston—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4611) for the relief of Sarah E. Caro and Henry O. Bassett—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4612) for the relief of John Dunn—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4613) for the relief of B. W. Johnson—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4614) for the relief of Sarah A. Marcus—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4615) for the relief of William T. Bell—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4616) for the relief of the heirs at law of Edward N. Oldmixon—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4617) for the relief of the heirs of Manette Marsons, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4618) for the relief of Chester P. Knapp, of Escambia County, Fla.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4619) granting a pension to Susan Kent—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4620) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Andrew Brewton—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4621) releasing unto W. J. Cosgrove, Mary Cosgrove, Mary Ellen Aylward (born Cosgrove), and others any rights the United States may have in certain lands in Pensacola, Fla.—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. LUCKING: A bill (H. R. 4622) granting a pension to William E. Martin—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4623) granting a pension to Electa L. Willard—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4624) granting a pension to Isabella Phelps—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4625) granting a pension to Theresa B. Nash—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4626) granting a pension to Hattie M. Matheson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4627) granting a pension to Annie Young—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4628) to repay \$473.20 excess duties paid by Richard Hawley & Sons—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MADDOX: A bill (H. R. 4629) granting an increase of pension to Thomas C. Pond—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4630) granting an increase of pension to T. S. Collins—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4631) granting an increase of pension to Julius Kraig—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MAHONEY: A bill (H. R. 4632) granting an increase of pension to Peter J. Lussem—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MARSHALL: A bill (H. R. 4633) granting an increase of pension to William Paul—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. McCLELLAN: A bill (H. R. 4634) granting an increase of pension to Randolph T. Stoops—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. McMORRAN: A bill (H. R. 4635) granting a pension to Susan Bigler Smith—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. McCLEARY of Minnesota: A bill (H. R. 4636) granting an increase of pension to Martin J. Severance—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. OVERSTREET: A bill (H. R. 4637) authorizing and directing the Secretary of the Treasury to pay James L. Anderson the sum of \$798.28—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. PATTERSON of Tennessee: A bill (H. R. 4638) granting an increase of pension to Mary E. Pillow—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. PEARRE: A bill (H. R. 4639) for the relief of Horace Resley—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4640) granting an increase of pension to William H. Johnston—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4641) to reimburse and indemnify the town of Frederick, in the State of Maryland—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. POWERS of Maine: A bill (H. R. 4642) granting an increase of pension to William L. Wheeler—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RANDELL of Louisiana: A bill (H. R. 4643) for the relief of John McDonnell—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. RICHARDSON of Alabama: A bill (H. R. 4644) for the relief of the heirs of John Meals, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4645) for the relief of Mrs. Bathsheba Gordon—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4646) for the relief of John Till—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4647) for the relief of John Jones—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4648) for the relief of Ann E. Damon—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4649) for the relief of the legal representatives of the estate of Thomas F. Brumby—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4650) for the relief of Charity Boyed—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4651) for the relief of Mrs. W. R. Britton—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4652) for the relief of Mary J. Bailey—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4653) for the relief of the heirs of James T. Anderson, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4654) for the relief of the heirs of George W. Hughes—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4655) granting an increase of pension to Henry Jeffers—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4656) to authorize and direct the Secretary of War to grant an honorable discharge to Robert Crompton—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4657) to refer the claim against the United States of the heirs of Fabian Varin to the Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. ROBERTS: A bill (H. R. 4658) raising the rank of Surg. John W. Baker, on the retired list of the Navy—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. RODEY: A bill (H. R. 4659) for the relief of John S. Van Doren—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4660) granting an increase of pension to Henry C. Reel—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RYAN: A bill (H. R. 4661) for the relief of John Brill—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SHAFROTH: A bill (H. R. 4662) for the relief of the heirs of John Baxter—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4663) for the relief of Joseph D. Campbell—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4664) granting an increase of pension to Charles Carlisle—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SNOOK: A bill (H. R. 4665) granting a pension to Malissa Thomas—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4666) granting a pension to Albert Cogswell—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4667) granting an increase of pension to James Turner—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4668) granting an increase of pension to Simon McCall—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SPARKMAN: A bill (H. R. 4669) granting an increase of pension to Lewis S. George—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4670) granting a pension to Green W. Hodge—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4671) for the relief of Adam L. Eichelberger—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4672) for the relief of Mariah L. Trowell, administratrix of Benjamin F. Trowell, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4673) for the relief of Carolyn M. McIlvain—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. STERLING: A bill (H. R. 4674) granting an increase of pension to John Thompson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. THOMPSON: A bill (H. R. 4675) for the relief of the estate of Moses K. Wheat, deceased, late of Macon County, Ala.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. TOWNSEND: A bill (H. R. 4676) granting an increase of pension to James B. Judson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WARNER: A bill (H. R. 4677) granting an increase of pension to William Nichol—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4678) granting an increase of pension to John Magee—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WARNOCK: A bill (H. R. 4679) granting an increase of pension to Martha M. Pierce—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. VAN VOORHIS: A bill (H. R. 4680) granting a pension to Jonas Ball—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, the following petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By Mr. ADAMS of Pennsylvania: Letter of the Iron Molders' Union of North America, No. 111, of Philadelphia, requesting the passage of an eight-hour law and an anti-injunction bill—to the Committee on Labor.

Also, resolution of the Travelers' Protective Association, Post B, Pennsylvania Division, relative to a 35-foot channel for the Delaware River, port of Philadelphia—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, resolution of the National German-American Alliance, against the passage of the Hepburn bill, relating to interstate liquor traffic—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BADGER: Resolution of J. C. McCoy Post, No. 1, Grand Army of the Republic, Columbus, Department of Ohio, relative to the use of old Springfield rifles by Old Guards and Grand Army of the Republic drill corps in such organizations of the United States—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, resolution of J. M. Wells Post, No. 451, Grand Army of the Republic, Columbus, Department of Ohio, relative to the use of old Springfield rifles by Old Guards and Grand Army of the Republic drill corps in such organizations of the United States—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BIRDSALL: Papers to accompany bill to increase pension of James Mattingly—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BURKETT: Paper to accompany bill to increase pension of William McBrien—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, letter from Charles Weston, Lincoln, Nebr., in favor of denying the use of the mails to fraudulent insurance companies—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, paper to accompany bill to pension Victor Vifquain—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CALDERHEAD: Resolution of National German-American Alliance against the passage of the Hepburn bill, relating to interstate liquor traffic—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CALDWELL: Petition of Elsie Peiffer, of Pana, Ill., for pension—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. DANIELS: Resolution of the board of supervisors of Inyo County, Cal., favoring the construction of a trail to the

Summit Whitney, in said State—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, resolution of George A. Custer Council, No. 22, Junior Order United American Mechanics, of Oakland, Cal., favoring restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration.

By Mr. DICK: Papers to accompany bill for relief of John A. Wanless—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. DRAPER: Resolution of the national executive committee of the National German-American Alliance protesting against the passage of the so-called Hepburn bill—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ESCH: Resolution of Cigar Makers' Union No. 25, of Milwaukee, Wis., protesting against the passage of Cuban reciprocity bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, papers to accompany bill to increase pension of Mahlon Farmin—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HUFF: Resolution of the Pennsylvania Shoe Manufacturers' Association, favoring 35-foot channel for the Delaware River, port of Philadelphia—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, resolution of the Grain and Flour Exchange of Pittsburg, Pa., favoring legislation enlarging powers of the Interstate Commerce Commission—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, resolution of the National German-American Alliance, against the passage of the Hepburn bill relative to interstate liquor traffic—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HULL: Paper to accompany bill H. R. 3240, to pension Helen A. Scholes—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, paper to accompany bill H. R. 3243, to increase pension of Warren Closson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KINKAID (by request): Petition of citizens of Atkinson, Nebr., protesting against passage of parcels-post bill—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also (by request), petition of citizens of Ainsworth, Nebr., urging amendment of the homestead laws—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also (by request), petition of citizens and freeholders of Wheeler County, Nebr., favoring amendment of the homestead laws—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also (by request), petition of citizens of Johnstown, Nebr., favoring amendment of the homestead laws—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also (by request), petition by citizens of Cherry County, Nebr., favoring amendment of the homestead laws—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also (by request), petition of citizens of the State of Nebraska, favoring amendment of the homestead laws—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. MCCLEARY of Minnesota: Letter of the National Cigar Leaf Tobacco Association, opposing the Cuban reciprocity bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, letter of the Minnesota Commandery, Military Order of the Loyal Legion of the United States, favoring a service-pension law—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, letter of John A. Logan Regiment, No. 2, Union Veteran Union, St. Paul, Minn., favoring passage of a service-pension law—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MORRELL: Resolution of the Travelers' Protective Association, Post B, Pennsylvania Division, relative to a 35-foot channel for the Delaware River, port of Philadelphia—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, resolution of the National German-American Alliance, against the passage of the Hepburn bill relating to interstate liquor traffic—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. NEEDHAM: Petition of Sacramento Chamber of Commerce, relating to the establishment of an additional Federal court to be located at the city of Sacramento, Cal.—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. OVERSTREET: Papers to accompany bill for relief of James L. Anderson—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. POWERS of Maine: Papers to accompany bill to increase pension of William L. Wheeler—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RUPPERT: Resolution of the National German-American Alliance, against the passage of the Hepburn bill relative to interstate liquor traffic.

By Mr. RYAN: Paper to accompany bill H. R. 4365, to pension Barney L. Brookins—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SMITH of New York: Petition of Leonard Govern and 89 other citizens of Stamford, N. Y., urging an amendment to the Constitution defining legal marriage to be monogamic, and making polygamy a crime against the United States, etc.—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WANGER: Resolution of the board of directors of the Grain and Flour Exchange of Pittsburg, Pa., favoring enlargement of the power of the Interstate Commerce Commission—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.